



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## CRITICAL NOTES ON OLD TESTAMENT HISTORY.

## VII. LITERARY AND HISTORICAL CRITICISM.

BEFORE bringing to a close the present series of notes on the early history of Israel, it is necessary to refer briefly to some methods and results of criticism which will be found to bear upon the sections which follow. The study of Old Testament history is peculiarly difficult, partly because it is a religious history and closely bound up with religious convictions, but more especially because the complexity and scantiness of the written material preclude finality. Although there is unanimity among O. T. scholars regarding the essential results of literary criticism, there is a marked absence of uniformity in the individual standpoints and in the handling of historical problems. Thanks to unintermittent labours in the past decades, it is possible to trace some development of Israel's religion and institutions, but to the corresponding growth of her traditions comparatively little attention is paid. This is particularly true of the earlier periods, and it is not an exaggeration to assert that no single reconstruction either adequately accounts for all the evidence or is free from problems which future workers will find as grave as some of those which literary criticism has already solved. This is due not merely to the difficulty attending the interpretation of the evidence, but also to the tendency to distribute criticism unequally and inconsistently. That exact criticism which has been directed towards details of law and cult is less prominent when historical problems are at stake, and there is apt to be a tendency to obscure evidence in a manner which—where the Hexateuch is in question—would be recognized as unmethodical. "The work of historical criticism," as Prof. Briggs has said, "has only begun its career<sup>1</sup>."

There are four distinct lines of investigation upon which the problem of the early history of Israel could be attacked. (1) From the Amarna tablets, and other external evidence, it would be possible to obtain a number of "tangible facts," with the help of which it

<sup>1</sup> *General Introduction to the Study of Holy Scripture* (Edinburgh, 1899), p. 531. In the past stages of criticism it has been observed that at every fresh advance and at every new concession, where certain old positions were resigned, there has been a tendency to cling even more tenaciously to other positions.

would be easy to make a judicious selection of O. T. data which could be made to agree. This method, which may be called the purely "archaeological," consists in bringing together evidence which was not meant to be compared, and is conspicuous for its free (though tacit) rejection of the bulk of traditional material which is opposed to the archaeological results. So uncritical and haphazard a method may be left to itself<sup>1</sup>. Or again (2), there is the literary-critical method, which relies upon stories of the patriarchs, tribal relations, national genealogies, &c., material which is at all events considerably later than the period to which it refers. Naturally, the data are not implicitly accepted, but, by the help of historical theories, they are carefully sifted, and the results are applied to early Israelite history as a whole. They depend upon working hypotheses, which may be faulty, they suffer from the lack of early information, and are always liable to confuse the original meaning of the records and their real intention. This, the prevailing method, runs the risk of not being sufficiently historical<sup>2</sup>. A third method (3) would be that which has been profitably undertaken in other departments of O. T. research. The attempt could be made to determine the indispensable features of tribal life and custom, the usual results of invasion, the extent to which invaders are absorbed (or the reverse), and leave their marks upon a land (nomenclature, &c.). It would endeavour to ascertain the leading tendencies of Palestinian life and thought, and it would take into account the characteristics of early historians in other fields. In a word, it would direct its attention to those details which can be studied more thoroughly *outside* the O. T. in the hope of acquiring an amount of experience (not to mention a body of reliable evidence), by means of which the history of Israel could be more luminously reviewed, and its vital characteristics more safely determined. That this, the comparative method, is ultimately indispensable for O. T. research, will

<sup>1</sup> It is interesting to notice that the Egyptian evidence for the early occurrence of Israelite names (e. g. Asher) has led to the paradoxical conclusion that there were Israelites in Palestine before the Exodus, i. e. that some of the sons of Jacob had remained behind when the rest went into Egypt, or that some escaped from Egypt before the main body. Generally speaking, it is singular that the semi-archaeological theories propounded by Orr (*Problems of the O. T.*, pp. 422 sqq.), Petrie (*Researches in Sinai*, chap. xiv), and many others, are often regarded as confirmatory of the O. T., in spite of the upheaval of tradition which is involved.

<sup>2</sup> Apart from the fact that the ethnological interpretation can be easily pushed to excess. Cp. Ed. Meyer's remarks, *Die Israeliten und ihre Nachbarstämme*, pp. 50, 251 sqq., 422, note 1, 444 sq.; also Cheyne, *Ency. Bibl.*, col. 5211 (§ 14).

scarcely be denied. But, finally (4), it is at once obvious that it would be unmethodical to *force* the O. T. into agreement with conclusions drawn from any external source. Any *a priori* assumption that that which actually happened is that which the early writers intended to represent would be premature. One must, therefore, apply literary *and* historical criticism, and apply it consistently; one must seek to distinguish between earlier and later phases of thought and tradition, and must treat the evidence in a natural manner, not in the immediate expectation of determining its precise historicity, but rather in the hope of ascertaining what the various writers *believed* to be the history of their past.

Any attempt to study the evidence of the O. T. anew must naturally lay aside preconceived theories, and must be prepared to follow the evidence and not to direct it. It is indispensable that the literary phenomena should be observed, since it is certain that whatever future research or discovery may bring *these* cannot alter. Nothing can remove the present complexity of the O. T. (not even cuneiform originals!), although it is obvious that particular interpretations may be found to need modification or the hypotheses which have been framed upon the latter may prove erroneous. Consequently, one must refrain from fettering oneself with those literary theories which are admittedly provisional and hypothetical, or which rest upon historical grounds the sources for which history have not been independently or adequately tested.

Now, we have to deal with the records of a layer of population which spread itself over an already inhabited land. It is known that when a people is well seated in a region, fixed to the soil by agriculture, and thoroughly acclimatized, it offers an enormous resistance to absorption, whereas the conquerors—or even peaceful immigrants—are apt to be psychically conquered by those whom they have overcome. Israel entered Palestine and lived its history, but the land itself and the people of the soil still retain traces of “primitive Semitic” cult and customs, in spite of the many changes that have swept over the land. Hence, it cannot be ignored that already in the fifteenth century B. C. Palestine was occupied by a *settled* race, whose language, thought, and other features, do not differ vitally from those of the people we meet with in the O. T. There are, naturally, profound differences, but a comprehensive survey of the O. T. in the light of the external evidence proves that a great deal of that which we regard as “Israelite” could and did exist outside the area or the period of Israelite influence<sup>1</sup>. Moreover,

<sup>1</sup> The interesting phraseology of the Amarna Letters, the Taanach tablets, the Phoenician sacrificial institutions, and a wealth of other

we cannot obscure the fact that the writings of the O.T. will represent as specifically Israelite, features of cult, custom, and tradition, which were not the peculiar possession of the invaders, but were the result of absorption and fusion which commonly result when tribes merge. This is quite intelligible when we observe what has happened in other fields under similar circumstances, and although we can fully appreciate the Israelite standpoint of the records, it is manifestly necessary to recognize and make allowance for it. Accordingly, for the early history of Israel, we have to rely upon the traditions which the Israelites themselves have transmitted, we have to study the history of an ancient land, a land which has suffered relatively little from the turmoil of other invasions, from the standpoint of the invaders. This will at once show that historical criticism cannot inevitably adopt *their* attitude and disregard other standpoints<sup>1</sup>.

The ordinary methods of historical research, indispensable when one is fortunate enough to possess an abundance of documents, cannot be rigidly applied in O.T. criticism. The scantiness of the evidence, its literary features, and the familiar characteristics of

evidence may seem to show the danger of attempting to sketch "Israelite" religion solely on the basis of Israelite literature.

<sup>1</sup> Similarly, in estimating the exilic and post-exilic periods there is an inclination to adopt the standpoint of the exiles and of those who returned to Palestine without reflecting upon the character of the evidence. The three books, Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, are properly a single work, although of composite origin. The compiler carries the history of Judah down to the destruction of Jerusalem, passes over the seventy years of desolation, and at once proceeds to the history of the Return. His sympathies are with those who returned, not with the remnant that had been left, although it is certain that it was not a negligible quantity as regards religion or culture. Besides, not only had Palestine *not* been denuded, but exiles had been deported to other places apart from Babylonia. However, for his purpose, the compiler ignores this; he rejects the material which deals with the years immediately after the fall of Jerusalem, and omits to mention the favour shown to Jehoiachin. This is quite intelligible when we understand *his* standpoint, but one will be led to inquire whether this later theory (which he follows) has had an influence upon the literature elsewhere. One may perhaps suspect that the abrupt ending of 2 Kings (cp. also Jeremiah) is due to the excision of material which would have clashed with the compiler's new history, and it is probable that it has left its mark upon the prophecies ascribed to Jeremiah, notably in the tendency to emphasize the fate of the *remnant* of Judah (Jer. xlii-xliv; cp. the variations in LXX, also Schmidt, *Ency. Bibl.*, col. 2379).

early writers unite to emphasize the futility of treating the records by "rules" of research. There are so many factors to be taken into account, so many possibilities for which allowance must be made, that too much caution cannot be exercised. There is the "caution" which impels the historian in other fields to accept only those data which can be placed beyond dispute; there is the "caution" in O.T. study which may be synonymous with credulity, or may imply an ability to reconcile reason with tradition. It is to be presumed that the most scientific "caution" will allow for the circumstances under which the records have been written, and will be attentive to the "methods" which the early writers themselves employed<sup>1</sup>.

The great disadvantage under which O. T. research labours, through paucity of material, is at once felt when the presence of legend or myth may be suspected. It is well known that legendary and mythological elements encircle historical figures with a rapidity which is sometimes almost inconceivable. It is known, too, that such elements will readily transfer themselves from one figure to another, and that even whole cycles will be borrowed and adjusted to an environment with which they have no material connexion<sup>2</sup>. It cannot be denied that this process is to be found in the Semitic field, but historical research obviously cannot start by attempting to separate fact from fancy; it will be safer to allow for the possibility that in some cases history has been clothed (perhaps unconsciously) in an unhistorical dress. To be impartial, however, we cannot start with the assumption that unreliable accretion has *not* been attached to figures apparently historical, or that *no* historical elements underlie those where legend and myth can be recognized. The O. T. has preserved traditions—the term does not necessarily mean untrustworthy or unhistorical literature—all of which were doubtless equally reputable in their age. Modern research compels us to reject Gen. i–xi, and we treat it not as scientific and historical information, but as a human record to be read in the light of the age in which it was written. Many critics reject the patriarchal

<sup>1</sup> Thus, incidentally, it is not enough to recognize the compilatory character of the sources, it is quite as important to observe the methods of compilers where composite works can be compared with the original sources. Greater attention to the actual working of compilation would prevent that rigidity of literary and historical criticism which is occasionally noticeable.

<sup>2</sup> Bernheim, *Lehrbuch der historischen Methode* (1902), pp. 323 sq., 461 sqq. For a recent study of such transference, see Gaster, 'Legend of Merlin,' in *Folk-lore*, xvi, 1905, pp. 409 sqq.

narratives, and again we realize that the sources are the product of subjectivity; they represent familiar beliefs which to the people of the age were as truly historical as other records, which we regard as history, are to us. Other critics commence the history of Israel at other periods, although it is obvious that to understand our evidence we must place ourselves in the position of the writers and ascertain *their* views. We must be sufficiently appreciative and sympathetic to assimilate the writers' attitudes, and sufficiently modern and critical to estimate them at their true value. Thus, we must avoid any initial distinction between narratives apparently historical and those apparently less reputable. To be consistent, it is difficult to see why the traditions of great kings should not have been influenced to the same degree as the ancestral figures; or why the floating elements of legend and myth should not have attached themselves with equal readiness to either. We cannot assume that the "historical" writings were not subjected to the same influences (whether external or internal) as those less historical, nor can we draw any arbitrary distinction between the literary and historical criticism of the Hexateuch and the criticism of those books which were styled (not without good reason) the "Former Prophets." A hasty survey of some of the "methods" of the early writers and of literary criticism alike may be found suggestive.

Where the same motives or traditional elements appear in distinct figures, it may be unnecessary to determine priority, but it invariably happens that duplication of incidents is attended by features of considerable importance for literary or historical criticism. How perplexing the data may be is evident when we notice the separation of Lot (cp. the Edomite name Lotan), Hagar-Ishmael, and Esau-Edom from Abram, Isaac, and Jacob respectively: the significance naturally lies in the close connexion between the members of each triad. It may not be easy to interpret this, but we can infer at all events that these details do not prove successive stages in the ethnological history of Palestine<sup>1</sup>. Another kind of duplication appears in the comparison of Saul's wars (1 Sam. xiv. 47 sqq.) with David's conquests (2 Sam. viii). If we accept the common view that the former has

<sup>1</sup> In the stories of Abraham and of Isaac at the court of Abimelech it is instructive to notice the ingenuity shown in bringing the two into connexion (Gen. xxvi. 1, 15, 18); a comparison suggests that the story of Abraham (xx. xxi. 22-34) was originally consecutive. To assume that doublets point to two sources is unnecessary unless a double thread can be traced; a compiler will often introduce another version or a variant, although his work is now a unit (cp. Brockelmann's study on Ibn-el-Aṭīr's *Kāmil* in its relation to Ṭabari, Strassburg, 1890; especially pp. 17 sq.).

been based upon the latter, it is necessary to observe that the writer's friendly interest differs markedly from the tendency of other narratives; if it is due to a redactor, one must ascertain its relation to the account of Saul's rejection, the insertion of which is also ascribed to a redactor; if it is unhistorical, the earlier and fuller account which it is supposed to replace must be equally untrustworthy. At all events, if once its value is doubted, upon what grounds is the value of the panegyric (2 Sam. i) to be upheld? But let us note, in any circumstance, that the excerpt is ascribed to modelling and not to invention.

If older prophecies were adapted to new occasions<sup>1</sup>, it is equally likely that historical material was used with similar freedom. It is extremely probable that the account of the journey from the Red Sea to Sinai consists of narratives which belong properly to a later context. They have been transferred with a certain amount of redaction to bring them into harmony with the new setting<sup>2</sup>. There has been manipulation and revision, but not originality or invention, and *because* these simple methods have been employed, and *because* sufficient indications remain to prove their present unsuitability, criticism was able to perceive the anomaly. Also, the stories of Elisha "in which the prophet appears as on friendly terms with the king, and possessed of influence at court, plainly belong to the time of Jehu's dynasty, though they are now related before the fall of the house of Omri<sup>3</sup>." It is agreed, further, that the writer in Ezra iv, who proposed to give an account of the opposition to the Jews, used a passage which is hopelessly at variance with chronology; vers. 6-23 are admittedly borrowed from another context. Finally, it is extremely probable that the Reading of the Law by Ezra on the *seventh* month (Neh. viii), so far from having been delayed a score of years after his return, originally preceded the reforms of the *ninth* month (Ezra ix)<sup>4</sup>. From the preceding examples we may perceive that the employment of such methods does not

<sup>1</sup> e. g. Isa. xv. sq.; prophecies on the Scythians (Zephaniah, Jeremiah), Zech. ix-xiv, &c.

<sup>2</sup> See J. Q. R., XVIII, pp. 741 sqq. Cp. e. g. Wellhausen, *Prolegomena*, pp. 342 sqq.; Kent, *Beginnings of Hebrew History*, p. 176; Moore, *Ency. Bibl.*, col. 1443.

<sup>3</sup> So W. R. Smith (cp. Kautzsch, *Ency. Bibl.*, col. 2670), Kuenen, Skinner (*Century Bible: Kings*, p. 290); cp. also Benzinger, p. 130; Addis, *Ency. Bibl.*, "Elisha," §§ 2, 5. The conclusion has an important bearing upon the criticism of that period.

<sup>4</sup> Torrey, *Ezra-Nehemiah*, p. 31; Kent, *Israel's Hist. and Biog. Narratives*, pp. 32, 369. Cp. G. A. Smith, *Expositor*, July, 1906, p. 10.



presuppose any very considerable lapse of time from the events themselves. The interval separating Ezra's age from that of the compiler is assuredly not greater than the interval between many of the earlier writings and the events they record. The reason for the transference is generally apparent. A view or theory of the past is represented which cannot stand the test of criticism, and if the anomalies are patent, it may be that the ancient "theory" has left its mark elsewhere upon the narratives of the period. We may perceive also that the aims of the historians were didactic, and that their historical insight was on a level with that of the great majority of early writers. It is evident that they did not hesitate to use historical material freely for definite purposes. But criticism is embarrassed by the discovery of such methods since the transference may be accompanied by subsequent redaction and amplified by later accretion to such an extent that the recovery of the earlier forms of the traditions may be practically impossible<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> As an apparent example of the free use of material it may be noticed that 1 Kings xv. 15 is now unintelligible, but the statement appears in a suitable context in vii. 51, and proves to belong to a narrative of the temple. Further, 2 Kings xi. sq. and xxii. sq. are closely related (cp. xii. 4 sqq. with xxii. 4 sqq.), and again the temple is concerned. Hence, there may have been a self-contained history of the sanctuary (Wellhausen). Now, it is singular that in xxii. 3 arrangements are made for the repair of the temple in the *eighteenth* year (of Josiah), whereas in xii. 6, in the *twenty-third* year (of Jehoash), the work is still incomplete; note the king's reproof, ver. 7. The literary evidence alone (cp. also xi. 14, 17 with xxiii. 2sq.) is naturally inconclusive, but it would almost appear as though the compilers drew upon this temple-history and adjusted it to their needs where necessary. See below, p. 379, n. 1. An apparent example of duplication may be found in the Aramaean wars of this same period. Under Jehu, a period of peace (2 Kings viii. 12 points to the future) is followed by the *beginning* of the wars (x. 32). After many disasters, Israel gains victories and peace is concluded (cp. xiii. 25 with 1 Kings xx. 34). Elisha's reproof and the judgement upon Ahab (xiii. 19; cp. 1 Kings xx. 35-43) have the same motive, and the former implies that Syria will reappear. This is actually pre-supposed in the victories of Jeroboam II, and the previous situation of Israel as implied in xiii. 5 b may be illustrated by the situation in 1 Kings xxii (especially vers. 17, 25). But all the Aramaean wars of Ahab are historically difficult. The last battles of Ahab and of Jehoram (cp. 1 Kings xxii. 1-4, 34-37, *Samaria*, and 2 Kings viii. 28 sqq. *Jezreel*) are virtually doublets, both are without a sequel (as regards the Aramaeans), and are extremely difficult to reconcile with the events of 854 and 842. And this variation between *Samaria* and *Jezreel* lies at the bottom of the story of Naboth's vineyard (cp. also 2 Kings x. 1, 11, 17).

The *historicity* of a journey from the Red Sea to Sinai cannot be denied on the grounds that the documents belong to a later stage. Although narratives may appear to be untrustworthy in their present form and context, it is *probable* that they are not the result of invention, and it is *possible* that the elements are correct, or that the compiler's general position is trustworthy. Manifestly, every case must be considered on its merits, and only historical criticism can determine whether the continuity has been broken. Thus, it must be recognized that narratives, however unreliable as they now stand, are doubly serviceable: first, for the light they throw upon the intention of the compiler and his historical views, and second, for their inherent value when considered in the light of the context or period to which they properly belong<sup>1</sup>. It is far from unlikely that the knowledge of early relations with Babylonia or of the early history of Egypt influenced the story of an Abram and Amraphel or of a Joseph, and the notice of the relative age of Zoan and Hebron (Num. xiii. 22)—whether correct or not is a secondary matter—is a valuable hint for the existence of some kind of tradition upon which Israelite writers could work. So, again, although the story of Zerah the Cushite probably refers to an invasion of Arab tribes, it is not unlikely that the compiler knew of the tradition that the Egyptian king, Uasarkon II, invaded Palestine, and that he used a narrative which appeared to be suitable—regardless of chronological niceties and other details. In an over-anxiety to decide the historicity of every narrative, there is apt to be a tendency to ignore the methods of compilers, and these, for a study which is yet in its infancy, are often quite as instructive as the facts of history itself<sup>2</sup>.

Obviously, the discovery of an historical element, or the proof of the accuracy of the compiler's general position, cannot substantiate

<sup>1</sup> It is the work of literary criticism to determine the extent of the redaction in the course of such transference, and to consider whether two narratives originally contiguous may have influenced each other (cp. e. g. the relation between Exod. xxxiii and Num. xi, XVIII, 748 above, and below, p. 369, n. 1). Textual corruption, also, may be doubly useful as illustrating both prevailing and earlier opinions (e. g. 2 Sam. vii. 23), and textual confusion itself is sometimes extremely suggestive of the alteration of earlier tradition (XVIII, pp. 532 sq., XIX, 173, n. 3).

<sup>2</sup> To avoid misunderstanding it should be added, perhaps, that the above conjecture regarding Zerah is only the first stage in inquiry (viz. the compiler's meaning and intention); there are naturally other questions, e. g. the historicity of an *Arabian* invasion in Asa's day; the relation between 2 Chron. xiv, xvi. 7-10; the period when Israelite writers would have access to Egyptian traditions, &c.

the genuineness of the entire narrative. The occurrence of historical names is no guarantee of historical truth, and this principle is to be recognized not only when Gen. xiv is in question, but in narratives reputedly historical. Thus, if the early writers knew that the Philistines entered Palestine at an early date, and if research has recovered the period of the early settlements of the Purusati, we cannot infer that those narratives which are relegated to the correct period are necessarily authentic. It happens that Gen. xxvi. 1 falls outside the limits, Exod. xiii. 17 may lie within; the group of stories relating to the great Philistine oppression before the monarchy may at least point to the recollection of an epoch-making invasion, but their authenticity is not necessarily assured thereby.

Since it is known that the O. T. contains narratives relating to the history of many centuries in sources of different periods (primarily undefined), it is evident that the first duty is not the extraction of history, but the recovery of their natural interpretation<sup>1</sup>. To be fair, allowance must be made for the fallibility of early historians, and for the scanty nature of the evidence. But, to be consistent, the evidence should at least be subjected to that examination which the theories of modern criticism rightly undergo<sup>2</sup>. Nevertheless, there is often a natural inclination to read the sources in the light of preconceptions, to adjust step by step each detail to individual stand-points, and to reject or ignore data which are found to conflict with a more prevalent view<sup>3</sup>.

The whole trend of O. T. history amply shows that there were different circles of thought and varying standpoints. Thus, it would be premature to attempt to decide upon individual details until the body of evidence had been surveyed as a whole. Literary criticism has recognized that the prevailing views where religion and law were

<sup>1</sup> Cp. Langlois and Seignobos, *Introduction to the Study of History*, pp. 143 sq.

<sup>2</sup> For example, the theory that the story of Sheba is impossible after the revolt of Absalom rests, in the first instance, on ordinary historical criticism, and *literary* objections are beside the mark (see p. 358, below). Budde's questions (*Sam.*, p. 296) : where were the Philistines? where was Abner? &c., miss the point, but this method of cross-examination is precisely that which must be directed towards the present traditions in turn. (On the theory, see XVII, 795, 798; Meyer, *op. cit.*, 484, n. 3; Luther, *ibid.*, 188, 195.)

<sup>3</sup> This is exemplified in the attempts to refute the critical view of the development of the Israelite laws, and *equally* when the objections to one critical theory are based upon another theory. A theory cannot be refuted by another theory, although (e. g. in the case of the date of P) the cumulative effect of evidence may be so strong that it overrides other evidence which otherwise appears to be trustworthy.

concerned are not necessarily the oldest; but they are precisely those which later writers or compilers desired their readers to accept. Historical criticism must be similarly guided.

When the traditions of Saul mention Judah (1 Sam. xi. 8, xv. 4) or Jerusalem (1 Sam. xvii. 54), the obvious inclination is to excise or emend, although is it not conceivable that the king to whom great victories were ascribed (xiv. 47 sqq.) might have been credited with having reigned over South Palestine? Thus, there is the possibility that these traditions ignored the situation which *other* traditions represent. So, also, the inclination to read "ephod" for "ark" in 1 Sam. xiv. 18, 1 Kings ii. 26, would be influenced by narratives which conflict with the representation in other passages, although it is obvious that elsewhere there are contradictory traditions of the ark (Judges xx. 27, contrast 1 Sam. iv. 3). As a matter of principle, it seems unmethodical to *force* a narrative into agreement with the history of the period, unless it unmistakably has the required historical background, and does not belong to another cycle of tradition. The natural procedure is to follow up conflicting details and divergent representations to ascertain, if possible, their several connexions and their relative position in the history<sup>1</sup>.

Such books as Chronicles and Jubilees prove that the "law of religious historiography" prevailed<sup>2</sup>; with the constant development of thought, the traditions could not remain unchanged. Reforms and innovations based their claim upon ancient authority. That which is to be accepted among the people must be in a certain sense

<sup>1</sup> On the danger of compromising or of reconciling divergences, see Bernheim, 502 sq., Langlois and Seignobos, 198—the method of textual criticism, when MSS. present variant readings, is analogous. For an illustration of divergence of method (David's Jairite or Jattirite priest), see XIX, 177. It is worth noticing that both Budde and Kennedy suspect interpolation in 1 Sam. xi. 8 (cp. also *J. Q. R.*, XVIII, 125, note 1), whereas Meyer finds that the high numbers belong essentially to the narrative. Budde, on 1 Sam. xiv. 18, observes that there can be no room for the ark because of vii. 1 (where it is at Kirjath-jearim); Kennedy agrees, but neither offer an adequate explanation of the present text, and both follow the LXX, which has mechanically avoided the inconsistency. H. P. Smith, on the other hand, very properly observes that the writer of xiv. 18 may not have known the other tradition. Needless to say, the practice of reconciling or removing difficulties is one which in Hexateuchal analysis is undertaken only with great caution—in 2 Sam. vii. 6, where another literary theory is concerned, divergence of tradition is recognized (see e.g. Kennedy, *ad loc.*).

<sup>2</sup> *J. Q. R.* XVIII, p. 739. See Kuenen, "The Critical Method," *Modern Review*, I (1880), p. 705.

old; it must not be at entire variance with current tendencies, but must represent the old in a new form<sup>1</sup>. The traditions of the past themselves represent the tendencies of the age; they depict former events as they then appear, and if it is unnecessary to insist upon the recognition of the *development* of tradition, it is nevertheless to be emphasized that the stages are usually neither sudden nor disconnected. For the development of tradition the account of the Exodus is invaluable. Any considerable body of composite documents is instructive for literary and historical criticism, since the results of investigation can be brought to bear upon scantier collections of material elsewhere. From these narratives<sup>2</sup> we see that (*a*) traditions are influenced by social or hierarchical changes, on the principle that the latter are rendered authoritative when a precedent is found for them in the age of Moses. The same principle is one that may well have been put into effect elsewhere, notably at the institution of the monarchy<sup>3</sup>. It is to be observed that in course of time Israel's interest threw itself ever further back into the past. The foundation of the monarchy (as the many traditions show) was once a favourite theme; somewhat later, the historical Psalms prefer to dwell upon the pre-monarchical times, and this tendency finds a still later development in the standpoint of the book of Jubilees. Moreover (*b*), it is extremely suggestive to observe that an older tradition (*viz.* the journey from Kadesh into Judah) now survives only in the most fragmentary form, because the later compilers and redactors have supplanted it by one which was more popular<sup>4</sup>. It can scarcely be denied that it once existed in a less incomplete form, and it is necessary to allow that (1) any vital or essential detail which is inconsistent with or contradicts the fuller view which now predominates may have existed in a more perfect form<sup>5</sup>, and (obviously) that (2) any absolutely isolated piece of evidence does not necessarily represent the only view, or even the true one. It is safe to assert in consequence (3) that no detail, however unique, can be ignored. By itself it may be meaningless—and may provoke the desire to

<sup>1</sup> Cp. with the above, Ibsen on "The Saga and the Ballad," *Contemporary Review*, September, 1906, p. 318. The reference is the more interesting since it shows the value of observing general principles.

<sup>2</sup> See, generally, § v.

<sup>3</sup> See XIX, 183; cp. also 1 Sam. xxx. 25 for one view of the origin of the law of booty.

<sup>4</sup> See below, p. 363.

<sup>5</sup> Thus it is possible that the charges to Elijah in 1 Kings xix. 15 sqq. are not due to amplification (XVIII, 124, note 2), but point to another representation of the history of that already obscure period.

emend or reconcile—but considered along with others (perhaps equally isolated), the series may constitute an organic body and possess a new importance. It is also instructive to observe that (c) although the narratives in Exod. xvi sqq. presuppose a law-giving which is justified by xv. 25 sqq., it is plain that they really refer to the events which follow; there is a certain accuracy of sequence, although the series *as a whole* is untrustworthy. The impression of unity and consecutiveness is thus deceptive<sup>1</sup>. Finally (d), among other features which call for notice are: the congregating of successive stages of tradition in the same context, the orderly development of the traditions, the evidence for the extent of literary activity in post-Deuteronomic times, and the closeness of P to the trend of earlier traditions<sup>2</sup>.

Literary criticism alone does not suffice to prove the credibility of any document. One narrative may be held to be more or less contemporary because it appears to represent genuine history<sup>3</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> See also XVII, 795, XIX, 183, note 1.

<sup>2</sup> The data are perplexing: Moses requests the help of Hobab, or Jethro lightens his legislative duties (Num. x. 29 sqq., and the parallel Exod. xviii.). But Moses asks also for a divine guide, and as a recipient of the divine spirit chooses seventy elders (Num. xi. 24 sqq.). On Deut. i. 9–18, see XVIII, p. 748. These features are associated with the reluctance of Moses, which in Exod. iv. 13–16 leads to the appointment of Aaron the Levite, and is followed by the journey to Egypt. Here the anger of Yahweh is kindled against Moses, and in other narratives there are allusions to obscure offences by the leaders of the people. Thus, Yahweh is wrath with Moses (Deut. i. 37) after the return of the spies, which at one stage was probably in a context corresponding to Num. xx. 1–13, before the journey from Kadesh (see XVIII, p. 746). Here, however, Caleb is selected (Num. xiii. sq.). Next, Meribah (Kadesh) is the scene of the election of the Levites (Deut. xxxiii. 8–11), and the present passage (Num. xx. 1–13) alludes to some offence by both Moses and Aaron. In Exod. xxxii Aaron alone is guilty (cp. Deut. ix. 20), and the incident leads to the selection of the Levites, but in Deut. x. 6–9 the latter is contemporary with the *death* of Aaron, which is now related in Num. xx, immediately after the “striving” at the waters of Meribah. These intricacies can perhaps be explained if we conceive cycles of traditions dealing with Mosaic clans, Caleb, Levites, and Aaron; at all events, they point to the fertility of the traditions of this period. The only cycle that survives more or less in its entirety is the late priestly story of the superiority of the younger sons of Aaron over the older, itself a development of the account of Korah’s revolt, with its insistence upon the superiority first of Levites over the laity and then of Aaronites over the Levites. See further, XVIII, 748 sqq.

<sup>3</sup> On 2 Sam. ix–xx, see below, pp. 358 sq., 380, n. 1.

Another, chiefly on linguistic grounds, may be placed some centuries later than the events themselves, but is regarded as a trustworthy representation of the social and religious life, and even of the history of the long-distant past<sup>1</sup>. A third may be separated by as great an interval (on various grounds), but refers to a period which is regarded as unhistorical, and is set upon another plane. It is obvious that only historical criticism can determine whether minuteness and other features are proof of authenticity or not. If there are some who are apt to be dazzled by the term "contemporary," it is plain from the second example that mere contemporaneity is not indispensable to accuracy. On the other hand, a document, which on literary grounds is held to be late, cannot be condemned for this reason alone. A late record may have had access to good sources, may represent history in a more unbiassed form, and may even represent only a late stage in the development of older tradition<sup>2</sup>. As in textual criticism, greater antiquity does not guarantee greater truth, and the oldest narrative (or manuscript) does not necessarily contain the oldest tradition (or text). On general grounds, the traditions in any late source may be based upon older material quite as reputable as that in earlier sources; and an insignificant period may separate the earliest portions of the late books from the latest portions of those which were completed at an earlier date<sup>3</sup>. Didactic writers will deal freely with their material, but their tendencies can usually be readily recognized. Consequently it is of importance to determine whether their methods were such as would influence their representation of tradition, and if it is found that they manipulated material, it will be a heroic step to maintain that they *invented* it. It is scarcely conceivable that a writer who wished to inculcate certain lessons should fortify himself by inventing his examples or even by using traditions which were at variance with popular belief. We have only to point to the judgment frequently passed

<sup>1</sup> On the old stories of the "judges", see below, p. 357, n. 1.

<sup>2</sup> The chronicler's version of Jehoshaphat's expedition to Ophir (2 Chron. xx. 35-37), in spite of his ships that went to Tarshish, is probably to be preferred to the fragment in 1 Kings xxii. 46-49 (Benzinger, Kittel, Skinner). Jehoshaphat was doubtless a partner, not only of Ahaziah (who reigned only a year), but also of Ahab, and the compiler in Kings has apparently altered the tradition from patriotic motives. That the intervention of the prophet Dodavahu may rest on older tradition is also probable (see the present writer, *Expositor*, Aug. 1906, pp. 191 sq.).

<sup>3</sup> The principle may be expressed as above in general terms; it becomes more cogent when we recall that the dates of the earlier sources are not fixed with any precision.

upon the Book of Chronicles. Here, since the same compiler is responsible also for the present form of Ezra and Nehemiah, it is obvious that all books must be "tarred by the same brush," although the attitude of criticism is often not consistently maintained towards the three. But the chronicler's recognized tendencies do not and could not affect a number of details which are very commonly ignored. His most "unhistorical" tendencies represent a development already found in earlier books, and to treat as worthless those traditions which cannot be controlled is to ignore both the scantiness of the earlier sources and the late survival of old literature, and presupposes a miraculous birth of legend for which no justification has as yet been found.

Literary criticism has already recognized that there was a tendency to emphasize the activity of religious figures in political history. The tendency to frame semi-historical stories in which the religious and didactic element predominates over the secular or political finds a late development in those "Words" upon which the chronicler has drawn. This feature continues to grow beyond his period; it was not a sudden growth, and the germs are already found in earlier writings. The deeds or "words" of Shemaiah or of Iddo appear to have been stories in which these figures were prominent; it cannot be assumed that they are entirely due to late "invention." Also, it can readily be believed that there were similar "words" of Samuel, Nathan, and Gad (1 Chron. xxix. 29), and one may even form some idea of their probable character. Consequently, it would be arbitrary to draw a sharp line of demarcation between those narratives in *earlier* books where seers and prophets play an important part, and that *later* development exemplified in the "words" used by the chronicler.

The date of a narrative or source only gives us the date at which the contents appear. Like the laws in D or P they may have existed for an indefinite period (in oral form or in some lost written record); they may have undergone ordinary development, or they may be influenced by some new tendency. Some kinds of tradition are as inveterate as tribal law or custom, but most are of a variable nature, dependent upon political conditions, tribal relations, and a variety of other factors. Unless we are assured that our tradition is of a kind to remain unchanged, the ease with which the traditional element grows and develops cannot be overlooked. Past events may be preserved partly in writing and partly in popular tradition. Thus they may be transmitted in different forms which could nevertheless be contemporary. If we consider the mass of traditional lore which must have existed in ancient Israel, it is evident that we



cannot assume that an allusion in any early writer proves that the tradition to which he refers existed in writing or even in the form in which it is now preserved. In addition to this, it is important to compare the written traditions in order to determine whether they undergo marked development or are comparatively immutable, and it is necessary to test the general chronological relation between the sources and the period to which they refer. Ultimately, the literary features of the sources where traditions diverge become of considerable value for historical criticism<sup>1</sup>.

The ancient historical writer uses sources not necessarily of the same age. We are absolutely dependent upon the material he has left, and are under the influence of the form in which it has been

<sup>1</sup> In the account of the Exodus there are several cycles of tradition which reach their final form in the post-exilic strata; one may infer that several sources had been in existence (see above, p. 354, note 2). In the stories of the patriarchs, on the other hand, the variation is comparatively slight, although J, E, and P appear to extend over many centuries. The old stories of the "judges" seem to have been found in two sources which were drawn from oral tradition, and, according to the ordinary view, are some centuries later than the date of the events. A few centuries later the Deut. redactor leaves the narratives undeveloped, although the traditions of the invasion appear to have undergone considerable growth in the meanwhile. If the stories of the "judges" represent the conditions faithfully, and if popular recollection was preserved in spite of the Philistine oppressions, the foundation of the monarchy, and the civilization of a Solomon, &c., the literary theory that they belong to the ninth century may or may not be correct, but it cannot be supported by the view that the knowledge of the early conditions could "hardly have been possessed by an author of the eighth century after the changes which two centuries of the kingdom and of rapidly advancing civilization had wrought" (Moore, *Judg.*, p. xxvii). We have yet to assure ourselves that this conception of Israelite development is correct, and that the civilization had not been already in the land from of old. In the books of Samuel, Budde finds in his E indications of a more romantic tendency as contrasted with his J (*Comm. Sam.*, p. xix), but obviously if there is *any* development of popular tradition between the times of J and E—what must it have been between J and the dates of the actual events? Kennedy, too, confidently ascribes the two ancient sources, C (the Court-history) and M (the earliest account of the monarchy, &c.), to the tenth century, but already M is held to contain incidents which "reflect rather the plastic mould of popular tradition, and a greater distance from the events than we find in C" (*Sam.*, p. 21). Has literary criticism taken into account the relation between the dates ascribed to the sources and the character of the traditions?

arranged. We can no longer hope to recover the sources he used, but fortunately he reproduces his material regardless of internal contradictions and the like. *His* criticism is apparent where his specific aims are in question; in his attention to his theme he passes over the various difficulties which enable modern criticism to perform its labours. Since a writer *can* include discrepant details in one source, it would be unmethodical to ignore or obscure their presence because the source appears to be a literary unit. For historical criticism, whether the literary features be present or not, apparent unity is no safe guide. But where compilation is already recognized (e.g. by linguistic data, &c.), change of source always provokes deeper inquiry. It is necessary to determine whether the underlying sources do or do not represent the same historical situation. Sometimes each source must be taken separately, or the gaps in one are to be filled from the other. Even where one may be a very late source, it may enable us to recover the original trend of the earlier which it has endeavoured to replace. It would appear from certain examples that the compilers or editors had a method in replacing one source by another, consequently the lateness of a narrative may be of little importance in the preliminary attempt to investigate the form which earlier traditions took.

A conspicuous example of the suggestiveness of purely *literary* criticism is afforded by the present structure of Judges and 2 Samuel. It is very generally agreed that the Deuteronomic editor placed a collection of older stories in his own characteristic framework (Judges ii. 6-xvi. 31); and that those passages which are not marked by his hand, although apparently ignored, were replaced by another editor at a subsequent date. Similarly, it has been held that the Deut. redactor ignored certain chapters, including the whole of the court-history (2 Sam. ix-xx), but these, too, were inserted by a later and more liberal hand. The reasons adduced to explain the omission partly prove too much, and are partly not sufficiently comprehensive, but there can be little doubt that literary criticism is correct in ascribing the present passages to post-Deuteronomic activity<sup>1</sup>. Now let us observe the significance of these results. The court-history is unanimously taken to be an almost contemporary narrative, and it is obvious that it must be by one who was in a position to obtain some remarkably intimate details, or, like other narratives of equal vividness, it reflects "the plastic mould of popular tradition." Like the old stories of the "judges," could it not be based upon oral tradition? Naturally, if once it appears probable

<sup>1</sup> On the assumption that 2 Sam. v-viii, in its present form, is due to a Deuteronomic editor.

that it is not a unit, the whole will require fresh and unbiassed investigation. If we accept the unanimous view, however, we perceive that the court-history of David represents traditions of (let us say) the tenth century; these are unchanged in the age *after* the Deuteronomic redaction, whereas the Davidic traditions appear in Chronicles in a highly developed form which is held to be unhistorical. In like manner, the record of the invasion in Judges i, although some centuries after the event, is unanimously taken to be thoroughly trustworthy; it is reinserted in the post-Deut. age, whereas in Joshua the tradition of the invasion seems to appear in another dress. Two traditions at a given age can vary widely, but it is obvious that some adequate explanation is necessary to account for the above features. It is of course possible that the hand which replaced Judges i ignored the very different representation which the account in Joshua affords, but it will probably be admitted that the historical significance of the literary process cannot be ignored<sup>1</sup>.

There are other points to notice. Is it assumed that the *language* did not change in the course of those centuries? The court-history at all events must be the current Hebrew after the Deut. redaction, and since the books of Samuel were essentially of a popular character, we gain some idea of the purity of the language in the exilic period. But with it we must contrast the marked linguistic peculiarities of the priestly code or of Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah. What is the bearing of the literary-critical conclusion upon ordinary theories of the development and decadence of Hebrew? It may be that

<sup>1</sup> It is always difficult to determine whether compilers paid due regard to the suitability of old material for their age, or whether they copied slavishly. It is obvious that "unto this day", in 2 Chron. viii. 8, xxi. 10, is of no value for the date of Chronicles; but may we feel sure that in 1 Kings ix. 21, 2 Kings viii. 22, and elsewhere, the phrase is a safe criterion? Through indiscriminate use of available material 2 Chron. xv. 17, xx. 33 hopelessly contradict xiv. 5, xvii. 6, but in one case the old source remains unchanged, and in the other old traditions had already been developed. In 2 Chron. ix. 11 the old reading (in 1 Kings x. 12) has been altered to prevent misunderstanding. What is to be made of the chronicler's "Arabians"? Are they due to ignorance of the earlier history, or has an older ethnic been altered to make the record intelligible to late readers? If the latter, the fact that "Arabians" are associated with the Philistines will suggest that earlier sources named "Edomites," and the necessity for the change will be obvious, since at a later period that name would suggest a people to the south of Judah. Elsewhere, however, where old sources are copied, "Edom" is retained, thus affording another illustration of lack of discrimination.

language and linguistic peculiarities are characteristic of circles or of schools; at all events, it cannot be argued that Deut. represents the current language of its day, since post-Deut. writings are not necessarily influenced by its vocabulary or even by its thought<sup>1</sup>.

If a post-Deut. hand was able to reinsert the old narratives, we must assume that old copies continued to survive to a late date<sup>2</sup>. Therefore, it is impossible to deny on *a priori* grounds that written traditions of the monarchical period existed in the late post-exilic period, e.g. in the chronicler's age. Again, it is naturally impossible to determine what variant traditions these copies embodied, and it is certain that, when once we have to admit that narratives have been reinserted in a post-Deut. period, literary criticism alone cannot decide whether the present narratives agree with those which are supposed to have been ignored.

It is manifest that these literary results are distinctly opposed to mechanical methods of O. T. criticism. At the least it is clear that the structure of Judges and of 2 Samuel presupposes the survival of older literature which escaped the Deut. redaction. Moreover, a comparison of the narrative portions of Deuteronomy with Exodus and Numbers *suggests* that there were other forms of earlier narratives apart from those which have been embodied, and, at the same time, proves the great extent of post-Deut. activity. From a comparison of the Massoretic text with the LXX it is evident that there was a very considerable fluctuation of tradition down to a very late date. Finally, a comparison of Exod. xxxv-xl with the LXX and the Samaritan Pentateuch is enough to show that the date of the Samaritan schism is not a decisive *terminus ad quem* for the criticism of the Pentateuchal problems. Accordingly, when we consider (a) the great variety of early tradition, of which only a portion has been preserved; (b) the late survival of early material in good classical Hebrew, uninfluenced by previous redaction; and (c) the ease with

<sup>1</sup> Moreover, the Deut. hand does not necessarily leave its mark in the writings it incorporates, even where the subjects of Deut. reform are in question (e.g. the altar in Judges vi. 24; cp. also the priests in 2 Sam. viii. 18). It is noteworthy that there is little variation in classical Hebrew *as a whole* when contrasted with the phenomena which at once disclose themselves in the language of such close neighbours as the Moabites. J and E, for example, are very closely akin, although narratives which were certainly written in Central or Northern Palestine have marked peculiarities. Cp. Judges v and the cycle of stories of Elijah and Elisha (the latter are Samaritan, they scarcely proceed from a more northerly district).

<sup>2</sup> Cp. Moore, *Intern. Crit. Comm.*, Judges, p. xxx.

which written sources could be rendered complex by casual redaction, it is evident that internal *literary* criticism must somewhere reach its limits. But, if these considerations will persuade some that the evidence is too scanty and intricate for *historical* criticism, it may convince others of the danger of accepting too readily the precise arrangement of the material or the particular representations which have been handed down.

Not only can earlier writings escape redaction, and thus be free from the tendencies of specific redaction, but the religious ideals and reforms which appear in the history do not necessarily represent the current stage of popular thought. They may indicate the high-water mark of opinion, but the popular religion is wont to lag sadly behind. Unless we know the circle from which a writing emanates we can scarcely tell *a priori* by what factors it would be influenced. Even ethical or sociological data are not decisive unless one can trace the development in the light of history. At any given period two contiguous circles may be separated by a gulf which will be reflected in the traditions of each, and a narrative with all the traces of primitive thought may even be later than one which proceeds from a more advanced circle. Many apparent criteria of this kind are of no chronological value. There are fine conceptions in pre-Israelite records, whilst Jubilees, despite its advanced colour, retains anthropomorphisms, primitive explanations of names, the popular sayings regarding the tribes, and takes no offence at the building of altars (vi. 1, xiii. 4, xxxi. 26)<sup>1</sup>. The essential character of the popular thought of its day is thus clearly manifest.

It is naturally helpful for the study of the conflict between nomad (or pastoral) and agricultural life and for the subsequent fusion of custom to observe the process at other periods or upon other soil, but it can hardly be assumed that for the O. T. we are confined to the *one* great wave of invasion with which the history of Israel begins. It cannot be summarily denied that there were posterior movements which could affect the traditions, and we can scarcely neglect the possibilities suggested by the evidence for the infusion of new blood in Samaria. Thus, it is especially interesting to recall Sargon's statement that the conquered Arab tribes of the desert (Tamud, Hayapa, &c.) were settled in the land of Beth-Omri (*Annals*, 94; *Cyl. Inscr.*, 20). This was about 715 B. C., and when we consider the usual result of the fusion of tribes and the relatively early date as compared with the literary history of the O. T., it is clear that

<sup>1</sup> So, also, narratives which appear to be life-like and truthful pictures of the past state of society to which they are relegated may represent conditions equally suitable to a much later date.

a purely general consideration of this nature is extremely suggestive for its bearing upon the internal conditions in Samaria<sup>1</sup>.

These notes on literary and historical criticism may be summed up in a very few words<sup>2</sup>. We have the records of a people which spread itself over Palestine, written with a purpose, and under the influence of varying ideas and standpoints. Also, they are the result of an intricate literary process, and allowance must be made for the character of the evidence whether taken as a whole or in the investigation of particular portions. But methods of criticism must be applied consistently, and the bearing of literary conclusions upon the history, and the converse, must be steadily observed. From a preliminary literary criticism one proceeds to historical criticism, and thence one returns to the re-investigation of the literary material in the light of history. In the end, however, we have to do with products of human thought, and the fundamental unity of the human mind widens the range by compelling us to pursue the interpretation of the O. T. in the light of comparative study in other fields.

<sup>1</sup> On general grounds, also, the survey of Israel's history suggests significant periods which would influence literary activity. It is reasonable to expect that the rebuilding of the temple of Jerusalem inspired new aims and hopes which would leave their mark upon the writings of the time. The differences between the pre-Ezran and post-Ezran periods are so profound that it might almost be taken for granted that they would show themselves in the treatment of past history. Literary criticism has already laid its finger upon the characteristics *after* the institution of Judaism on the lines of Ezra, and there are some signs that critics are beginning to recognize waves of activity in the preceding stage. See R. H. Kennett, *Journal of Theological Studies*, 1905, p. 184 (on the union of J and E), 1906, pp. 481 sqq. (on the date of Deuteronomy).

<sup>2</sup> See also XVIII, 133, 528 sq., 541 sqq., 739 sq., 744, n. 1. It need scarcely be stated that these notes make no pretence whatever of being a systematic exposition of principles. They merely arise out of the preceding sections and bear upon the pages which follow.

## VIII. SAUL AND DAVID.

IN our investigation of the early periods of Israelite history we have dealt independently with David (in 2 Samuel), with Saul and his relations to David, Samuel and Benjamin, and with the traditions of the Exodus. For the last-mentioned, the essential and vital detail is the recognition of the original pre-eminence of Kadesh<sup>1</sup>. This rests upon good evidence, and it was found that a number of narratives, which are now in other contexts, appear to have been originally associated with the sacred site. It is intelligible that its prominence should agree with the existence of early local stories, and that the later but more prevalent representation wherein Sinai becomes important should have involved subsequent redaction and rearrangement. If the evidence is sound, it would obviously be contrary to method to ignore the conclusion *because* it conflicts with another tradition, or to propose a provisional compromise in order to maintain a certain unity in the narratives.

There are *independent* grounds for the conclusion that an old tradition knew of a movement from Kadesh into Judah<sup>2</sup>. It survives in a fragmentary form because it has been supplanted by the prevailing theory that all the Israelites entered Palestine from the east under the leadership of Joshua. But it is intrinsically improbable that the conquest was delayed at the very gate of the promised land in order to expiate a fault, yet upon the story of the spies and the disobedience of the Israelites the more familiar tradition now hangs. The natural sequel to the *victory* over the Canaanites at Hormah is lost; we find instead unsuccessful overtures to Edom followed by a *détour*. This *détour* is anticipated by a precise command (Num. xiv. 25) which is

<sup>1</sup> See Section V (*J.Q.R.*, XVIII, 739-60); also Wellhausen, *Prolegomena* (Eng. trans.), pp. 342 sqq.; Stade, *Entstehung d. Volkes Israel*, pp. 12 sqq.; Guthe, *Ency. Bibl.*, col. 2222; Moore, *ib.* 1443 (v); Gray, *ib.* 5257 sqq.; H. P. Smith, *O. T. Hist.*, pp. 62 sqq.; Paton, *Syria and Palestine*, pp. 138 sqq.; Kent, *Beginnings of Hebrew History*, p. 206, and others.

<sup>2</sup> See above, XVIII, 352 sq., 757 sq., and cp. Wellhausen, p. 354; Moore, *Internat. Crit. Comm.*, *Judges*, pp. 12, 23, 31, *Ency. Bibl.*, col. 2608, 3443; H. W. Hogg, *ibid.*, col. 4526 (§ 4); H. P. Smith, pp. 83 sq.; Kent, p. 219; Steuernagel, *Einwanderung*, pp. 76 sq. The references in this and the preceding note could be multiplied, but they will probably suffice to show that some of the more important features in the present inquiry are already recognized.

enforced by the *defeat* which Israel suffered from the Amorites or Amalekites near Hormah. Accordingly the people turn back to the Yam Sûph and journey northwards to Shittim. The latter move is intelligible in itself, but the retreat from Kadesh has little probability and could be due to the attempt to reconcile a journey from Kadesh northwards with one from Ezion-geber along the eastern border of Edom and Moab.

Of these two main representations little of the former remains, although the prominence of Kadesh is enough to suggest its original importance. This invasion from the south (S) and the more prevalent tradition that the Israelites entered central Palestine from the east (C)<sup>1</sup> have influenced each other in course of development. Thus the story of Caleb has been conformed to C—as though the victory at Hormah (between Kadesh and Beersheba) was followed by a circuitous route via Ezion-geber, Shittim, and Gilgal; and the reverse process can be recognized when *Israelites* are the victors at Hormah, and when Joshua takes part in a defeat of Amalek (Exod. xvii) which, in its proper context, should be in the course of a movement from Kadesh northwards<sup>2</sup>. Joshua, in point of fact, hardly finds a place in the oldest traditions of S; he is the hero of C, and his appearance in the Exodus is probably due to that fusion and concentration which not rarely results whenever distinct traditions are blended.

It is clear that there are many "motives" which could and probably did affect the growth of these traditions, and although they may explain the present complicated literary character of the sources, the successive stages cannot, perhaps, be satisfactorily traced<sup>3</sup>. The extent of redaction which the laws alone presuppose, the possibilities of fusion—and of confusion—suggested by the terms "Goshen" and "Yam Sûph," the probability of subsequent migrations from the south (with blending of tradition), and the bearing of the political history of Edom and Moab upon the scenes of the narratives are factors of importance. There *appears* to be no old evidence to connect Kadesh with Egypt, but if the story of Joseph and the removal of his bones to Shechem (cp. also Jacob in Gen. l) could influence C, tribes from the south of Palestine were in close contact with Egyptian life at certain periods; and if the probability of the extension of the term Mizraim (Egypt) to the gulf of 'Akabah be doubted, close trading-con-

<sup>1</sup> For the sake of brevity these will be designated S and C.

<sup>2</sup> See XVIII, 352 sq., 758 sq.

<sup>3</sup> This intricacy, contrasted with the relative simplicity (whether apparent or real) of other groups of narratives elsewhere, is in many respects suggestive; especially instructive is the extent of the *post-Deuteronomic* redaction, and the continued growth of post-exilic tradition.



nexions between Egypt and Arabia can hardly be denied. It is worth noticing, also, that the father of a priest of Têma in an Aramaean inscription of the fifth century B. C. bears an Egyptian name; thus implying relations which naturally were not confined to that late date alone<sup>1</sup>.

Now this account of the movement from Kadesh in S is closely bound up with a number of other traditions. The Kadesh-cycle introduces Caleb, Dan (viz. Aholiab), Simeon, Mosaic clans (Hobab, Jethro, Kenites) and the ark. Later we meet with Caleb expelling the Anakites from Hebron and with Kenites in the negeb of Judah. The district around Bethlehem becomes associated partly with the later seats of southern clans, and partly (on genealogical and geographical grounds) with the southern home of Danites. Bethlehem itself is connected with Levites in Judges xvii. 9, xix. 1, and in xviii. 3 previous intercourse with Danites is implied. The Levites bear a class-name evidently later than the origin of the caste, their traditions take them back to Kadesh, their genealogies connect them both with clans of the south and with the family and kin of Moses. A Levite priest accompanies the Danites north; Simeon and Levi are associated with Shechem, and a Kenite clan is found in Naphtali. In course of time the Levites are spread over Palestine. David himself has relations with the south, Abiathar his priest (for the name, cp. Jether-Jethro) shares his wanderings and carries with him the ark, the installation of which reads like a climax and is regarded as such in Chronicles

<sup>1</sup> See *Corp. Inscr. Semit.*, ii. 113 (also Meyer, p. 450), and, generally, *J. Q. R.*, XVIII, 741, n. 1; XIX, 179, n. 1. The sites of Sinai and Horeb may be left open. It is of course "impossible to see why a people whose objective point was Canaan should have marched in the opposite [or in any other] direction" (Kent, p. 381); but one cannot bend the evidence to suit our historical judgment. Exod. xiii. 17 proposes to take the people away from possible warfare, but no sooner were they in Kadesh than war broke out, and the district (comparing Gen. xx. 1 with xxvi. 1) *could* be viewed as Philistine. The verse is probably intended to prepare the way for the introduction of Sinai; with it (ver. 19) belongs one of the very few references to the removal of Joseph's bones (which should have played an important part in the traditions of the Joseph tribes). To build up the journey of Sinai much rearrangement of material has been effected (see XVIII, 755 sq., and p. 348, above). It may be added that, on literary grounds, it has been doubted whether J knew of Sinai (Kuenen, *Hex.*, pp. 157 sq.), and that the Sinaitic laws are clearly less primitive than those which underlie Exod. xxxiv. The latter are closely associated with S, and Moore (*Ency. Bibl.* 1446) suggests that they were probably made at a Judean sanctuary (see below, p. 393, n. 2). Naturally, not *all* the Sinai traditions are based upon those of Kadesh (see XVIII, p. 756, n. 1).

(2 Sam. vii. 6 sqq.; 1 Chron. xxiii. 26). Ultimately the Levites are collected around Jerusalem, and David (whose traditional home is Bethlehem) is regarded as the organizer of the caste. It is in this district that we are bidden to look for the families of the scribes (1 Chron. ii. 55).

Moreover the genealogy of "Hezron" in 1 Chron. ii comprises Caleb and Jerahmeel, and extends even to the east of the Jordan where the ancestor takes to wife the daughter of Machir the father of Gilead. The Davidic traditions presuppose relations with Moab and Gilead which (on the ordinary view and in their present context) are difficult to understand. Finally, the traditions of the exodus in P suggest that there may have been a movement *from Kadesh* direct to the east of the Jordan, and the last narrative fragment in Num. xxxii. 39 sqq. actually relates the conquests of Machirites in Gilead<sup>1</sup>.

Thus we have here a number of details, apparently isolated, connected with Kadesh, Bethlehem, the Levites, and with David the maker of Judah. They appear in narratives which have been ascribed to all ages, and it is perfectly plain that some of them are quite untrustworthy. But they are linked together in such a manner that the results of literary criticism cannot enable us to draw the dividing line between fact and fancy, between authentic tradition and later reflection. It is well known that the ordinary "Israelite" traditions contain many unhistorical and exaggerated elements, and similarly S must be recognized as a body of tradition of unequal value. For the present it is evident that S must be kept quite distinct from the "Israelite" invasion from the east.

In turning to the Book of Joshua, the first noteworthy feature is the distinctive literary process which marks it off sharply from the Pentateuch. The Priestly hand which dominates the earlier books has scarcely left a mark in chaps. i-xii which narrate the invasion, whereas in the latter part it devotes considerable space to the tribal divisions. On the other hand, the Deuteronomic writer is found to prevail in the first half, and the literary evidence has suggested that there was "a Deuteronomic history of Israel from the invasion of Palestine to the establishment of the kingdom<sup>2</sup>." For historical criticism the oldest traditions are noteworthy. They comprise local detailed stories of attacks upon Jericho, Ai, and Bethel, and two fights of greater significance against united foes in the south and in the north. The conquest of central Palestine itself, although not de-

<sup>1</sup> See generally, for the evidence, Section VI, and, further, for Caleb, XVIII, 758-60; for Dan, *ibid.*, 354 sqq.; for P in Numbers, *ibid.*, 757 sq. (and Gray, *Numbers*, p. 282), and for S in east Jordan, XIX, 176 sqq.

<sup>2</sup> Moore, *Ency. Bibl.*, col. 2602 (§ 4).

scribed, is obviously implied in these latter, but the failure to supply the expected information should not be overlooked. It is true that the campaigns in x. sq., in their present form, are due to exaggeration and generalization, but we can scarcely reject the older kernel<sup>1</sup>—it can hardly be less valuable than other records (e. g. stories of the judges) which, on the current view, are separated by several centuries from the events themselves. Some place must be found for Joshua's achievements, and it is possible that they are traditions of central Palestine—of the extension of a people who had already taken possession of the land<sup>2</sup>.

It is very doubtful whether Joshua found a place in the oldest traditions in Exodus or Numbers, and there is no decisive connecting link between the earlier strata of his book and the wanderings in the wilderness. Hence it is safer to keep each distinct. It is to be recognized that we have to deal with an invasion from beyond the Jordan, but it is not easy to associate it either with Kadesh or even with a journey from Ezion-geber<sup>3</sup>. Central Palestine (with connexions east of the Jordan) is also the general standpoint in certain of the stories of the "judges," but the original links (both historical and literary) between the books of Joshua and of Judges are no longer clear. The "judges" carry us down to Jephthah—Samson is a Danite figure—and again the continuity is broken<sup>4</sup>. If, as Budde argues, the stories of Jephthah, Eli, and Samuel belong to the same source, it is obvious that there is a lacuna in the history between the first two, and if the narratives of Samson and the older portions of

<sup>1</sup> Even x. 28 sqq. has underlying old material.

<sup>2</sup> Cp. Guthe's hint, *Ency. Bibl.*, col. 2226. E already knew of the occupation of Shechem (Gen. xxxiii. 19, xlviii. 22). For the account of the invasion in Joshua, some allowance should be made for the possibility of confusion between the Gilgals and for the existence of a variant tradition that Joshua (like Jacob) crossed the Jordan at a more northerly ford (see XVIII, 539).

<sup>3</sup> Some critics do not recognize J in Joshua i-xii, and this may be influenced by historical theories which approximate but are not identical with our view of S. At all events this proves that the literary evidence is not decisive (see Carpenter, *Comp. of Hex.*, p. 376 note, and for general objections to the exclusion of J, Moore, *Ency. Bibl.*, col. 2602, § 6 with references).

<sup>4</sup> Judges ii. 6 compared with Joshua xxiv. 28, and the LXX addition to the Book of Joshua (viz. the introduction to the story of Ehud) point to possible pre-Massoretic forms (on the repetition cp. below, 380, n. 1). Both ignore Judges i which the Deut. redactor omitted (above, p. 358). On the age of the narratives see above, p. 357, n. 1, and for the literary hypothesis that J and E are to be recognized see, e. g., Moore, *Ency. Bibl.*, col. 2635.

1 Sam. iv-vi, and of Saul's rise are a literary unit, it is equally obvious that this will not simplify the work of historical criticism. A writer may naturally link together narratives of distinct origin, but it cannot be denied that in passing from Judges to 1 Sam. there is a gap in the history which the traditions do not allow us to fill. Moreover, the problem of the fortunes of the ark and of the disappearance of Shiloh continue to perplex all those who look beneath the surface. The fall of Shiloh (after the Philistine victory in 1 Sam. vi) is referred to by Jeremiah in terms that show that its fate would appeal forcibly to the priests and prophets of Jerusalem (Jer. vii. 12, xxvi. 6, 9). But it is amazing that Judah could be edified by a disaster which had befallen Israel many centuries previously, and unless the catastrophe were fresh in the minds of the people Jeremiah's words would have little significance. The problem of the history of the ark itself is equally serious<sup>1</sup>.

The vital fact for the study of this period is the Philistine oppression from which Saul delivered Israel. It was for this that he was anointed, although no preliminary account of the situation is preserved. On the other hand, a remarkable victory had already been gained by Samuel. But 1 Sam. vii is admitted to be relatively late and unhistorical, although there can be little doubt that some older tradition has been utilized for the purpose<sup>2</sup>. Samuel's great achievement, the prelude to the monarchy, connects itself with the introduction to the period of oppression as set forth in an extremely composite passage in Judges x. 6 sqq.<sup>3</sup> Here, when we find the distress of the Israelites, Yahweh's refusal to help, and their renewed protestations of penitence, and when Yahweh "could bear the misery of Israel no longer" (Judges x. 13-16), it is at once evident that "in the original connexion . . . ver. 16 must have been immediately followed by the raising up of the deliverer" (Moore). So also, when Yahweh declares to Samuel "I have looked upon the affliction of my people because their cry is come unto me" (1 Sam. ix. 16); can one find the prelude either in the wars of ch. iv sqq., or even in the story of Samson? Judges x. 8 sq. refers obscurely to the Israelites who were driven across the Jordan, not by the Ammonites, but apparently by the Philistines (ver. 7). Their position was hopeless (וַיִּצְרֹךְ לְיִשְׂרָאֵל מְאֹד). When Saul appears upon

<sup>1</sup> Budde leaves the question open (*Sam.*, p. 32), but it is surely important to know whether the history suddenly leaps from the times of the "judges" into the middle of the monarchic period, and the question has distinct bearing upon the literary problems.

<sup>2</sup> Cp. above, p. 350, and below, p. 384.

<sup>3</sup> See Moore, *Judges*, p. 276; H. P. Smith, *Sam.*, p. 4; Budde, *Sam.*, p. 49.

the scene the people are still in great straits (לַצָּר), some had taken refuge in holes and caverns, whilst others had fled to the land of Gad and Gilead (1 Sam. xiii. 6 sq.). Is it not evident that we must allow that either there have been serious omissions (after Judges x and after 1 Sam. vii. 1), or there have been equally serious insertions? The historical difficulties associated with Shiloh and the ark are enough to point to the second alternative, and it is highly probable that if the composite passage in Judges x. 6 sqq. *now* looks forward to Samuel's great victory, in an *earlier* form it was intimately connected with the earlier traditions of the rise of Saul<sup>1</sup>.

Drastic though this attempt to recover the original continuity may appear, it cannot be ignored that, of the narratives which intervene some are due to post-Deut. insertion or are relatively late, others deal essentially with another part of Palestine, belong to other cycles of tradition, or represent situations which elude plausible explanation. Moreover, it is manifest that for a correct conception of the times of Saul, we cannot overlook the presence of the non-Israelite district which formed part of (the later) Benjamin and Judah. It is commonly admitted that David's conquest of the Jebusites made free communication possible between the north and south, and that the earlier history was in many ways determined by a barrier of cities of which Jerusalem was only one<sup>2</sup>. But it is necessary to advance further and observe that all the narratives which ignore the situation appear *on other grounds* to be untrustworthy in their present form and context.

This is clear when we consider the traditions of Saul and David. Saul the pious and valiant king, to whose achievements the old poem in 2 Sam. i testifies, is not the Saul who predominates in 1 Samuel, although it is intelligible that the first king of Israel would be

<sup>1</sup> For the break in the continuity cp. the relation between Exod. xxxii-xxxiv and Num. x. 29 sqq. The chief points to be noticed are the recovery of the oldest traditions in 1 Sam. xiii. sq. (*J. Q. R.*, XVIII, 122 sqq.), the fact that chap. ix recognizes the oppression but ignores the exigencies of the situation (*ibid.*, 532-535); the general development of the traditions of Samuel (*ibid.*, 128, 347 sq.); the problems of Shiloh and the ark (*ibid.*, 350 sqq., 537, n. 2); the Danite migration and its relation to S (*ibid.*, 354 sqq.). On the general relation between the intervening subject-matter see *ibid.*, 347, 350 sq., 530, and XIX, 181 sq. See further, below, pp. 383 sqq.

<sup>2</sup> For the evidence see XVIII, 356 sq. Judges xix. 10 sqq. recognizes that Jerusalem was Jebusite; but 1 Sam. vi. 19-vii. 1 (Beth-shemesh, Kirjath-jearim) obviously stands in need of explanation (cp. XVIII, 537, n. 2). Every one feels the difficulty in the mention of Jerusalem in 1 Sam. xvii. 54, but it is singular that Saul's jurisdiction over the Israelite priests of Nob (to the immediate north) rarely excites comment.

a famous figure in central Palestine whatever people in *Judah* may have thought (XVIII, 121). David, on the other hand, was the first to unite north and south, and thus had claims upon both Judah and Israel. He was the founder of Judah and the head of a long dynasty. Whatever may have been the attitude of *Israel* (e. g. after the separation), Judah outlived its neighbour, and Jerusalem ultimately became the centre of a new organization after the exile. Very late tradition idealized David and made of him both saint and poet, and it is freely admitted that some of the later phases which conflict with the earlier are unreliable. But when we consider the earlier representations it is certain that they are not homogeneous. There is (*a*) David the son-in-law of Saul, a popular favourite of Israel, who is forced to flee from the court; he is consistently generous to the ignoble Saul, and closely bound by affection to the chivalrous Jonathan; after their death he becomes king of Hebron, but it is only after the death of Ishbaal that he accedes to popular desire and is made the king of a united people. On the other hand (*b*) there are some passages which find David in the extreme south of Judah, or as a semi-independent chieftain at Ziklag and Gath; he strengthens his position in the south by alliances and by politic gifts, and ultimately reaches the throne after conquering the Jebusites, whose city Jerusalem becomes his capital. The former of these is developed in Chronicles when (*c*) David becomes king after Saul's death, and it actually appears that many of the Israelites had seceded to him during his residence at Ziklag. The growth from *a* to *c* (easily recognized since the sources are quite distinct) is intelligible, but the relation between *a* and *b* (which appear in a series of continuous narratives) is obscured, and at every step there are difficulties of an historical character.

The conclusion that the tendency to idealize David's history has already made its appearance in the earlier books<sup>1</sup> finds support in several independent considerations. As regards 2 Sam., some weight must be laid upon the internal character of those narratives which presuppose close relations between David and Saul's family or Israel. In 1 Sam., apart from the literary evidence (viz. narratives ascribed to E and therefore later than J)<sup>2</sup>, we cannot ignore either the varying representations of Saul or the non-Israelite belt of cities. On the one hand, we have Saul every inch a king (1 Sam. xiv. 47-51)<sup>3</sup>, a worshipper

<sup>1</sup> Viz. in *a*; see above, XVII, 784, 787; XIX, 174.

<sup>2</sup> See below, p. 371, n. 1.

<sup>3</sup> Budde rejects xiv. 47-51, partly on literary grounds and partly because it conflicts with other representations of Saul's life. But if the Song in 2 Sam. i regards the king's death as a crowning misfortune and bears witness to this achievement and to his love for Jonathan, and if it

of Yahweh (ver. 35) and brave, and on the other hand, a petty figure living in a strip of land skirting the alien cities and constantly harassed by the Philistines. The unhappy picture we are apt to draw of him is based upon narratives where David enters into his history. The traditions of David the youth of Bethlehem at the court of Saul of Gibeah, the Benjamite king, ignore this intervening hostile district, yet it is upon this soil that the love sprang up between David and Jonathan, and the shepherd-lad became the idol of the Israelites. Where David's life is handled quite apart from Saul or when Saul is treated independently of David there are different standpoints; where they meet, and where the relations between David and Israel are engendered, it is forgotten that Jerusalem was still Jebusite, and that this city, and no doubt also the immediate neighbourhood, was only taken later by the sword. Moreover, however overpowering may be the bulk of these traditions, we cannot neglect the very different representation of David's attitude to the family of Saul which is preserved in 2 Sam. xxi, and whatever view may be taken of David's steps to the throne the real character of the bond between Judah and Israel must necessarily be judged in the light of later events. "Subsequent history shows how loose was the union of north and south, and the ease with which the separation was effected after a few years of joint rule under David and Solomon . . . favours the view that Judah, previous to the union, had never stood in any close relationship to Israel (or Benjamin)<sup>1</sup>."

is old (as Budde naturally admits), it is surely sounder method to recognize that the traditions conflict than to reject arbitrarily here and there.

<sup>1</sup> See the present writer's "Notes on the Composition of 2 Samuel," in *A.J.S.L.* (*American Journal of Semitic Languages*, XVI, 1900, pp. 145-77). In replying to various criticisms (in particular to Budde's exhaustive discussion in his Commentary), in the first of these sections (XVII, 782-99) it is admitted that the attempt to substantiate historical theories by pointing to traces of Ephraimite (or Elohist) redaction was a weakness in the argument. Budde, in his turn, attempts to prove both the literary unity of the narratives and the unity of the history, but is forced to recognize secondary elements in his older source. If it is admitted that one source will merge different representations (*Comm.*, pp. 59, 277, 310), if not all J is historically trustworthy, and if good material can be preserved in E (*Comm.* p. xx), literary criticism will not carry us far, and the fresh investigation from the standpoint of historical criticism is not excluded. Literary criticism, alone, has its limits in this case, although one of the most striking results which we owe to Budde is remarkably suggestive (above, pp. 358 sq.), and one of his many keen observations simply revolutionizes our conception of the Davidic traditions (see below,

To understand the bearing of this upon the traditions of David we must notice the situation after the death of Saul. Whether this king had connexions beyond the Jordan or not<sup>1</sup>, the Israelites fled eastwards after the battle of Gilboa and the court was set up at Mahanaim, obviously on friendly soil. Jabesh-Gilead, too, showed its gratitude for past benefits. From 2 Sam. ii. 8-10 *a* it appears that Israel so far recovered itself that Ishbaal became king over Palestine north of Jerusalem. Again we notice the redactor's interest in the political history of Israel (cp. 1 Sam. xiv. 47 sqq.). These fragments remind one of the annals which have been used in the book of Kings. They are naturally written each from its own standpoint and record the most important events in the briefest terms. Similarly, here, our passage brings us to one of the most significant points in early history and gives us only the bare recital of the extent of Ishbaal's kingdom<sup>2</sup>.

It is commonly understood that Ishbaal reigned in Israel as a vassal of the Philistines whilst David occupied the same ignoble position at Hebron<sup>3</sup>. On the other hand, it is very difficult to explain both the absence of the Philistines in 2 Sam. ii-iv and the scenes of the conflicts which are now placed *after* the capture of Jerusalem. The narratives in ii. 12-iv are of a somewhat popular character<sup>4</sup>, and in describing the war which broke out between David and Ishbaal, they recognize the close relations which had subsisted between David and Israel. But it actually appears from the words of Abner in iii. 17 sq. that not only had Israel longed for David, but David himself had been divinely commissioned to deliver Israel from the hands of the Philistines. This is no mere isolated phrase, since, at the close of Absalom's

p. 374; unfortunately the full force of it was not realized until Section VI was in print).

<sup>1</sup> XVIII, 541.

<sup>2</sup> The source is suddenly closed (see further below, p. 383, n. 1). The chronological note (ii. 10) is at variance with David's chronology (ver. 11) and is consequently rejected or ignored as a gloss! But surely one cannot rest satisfied with this summary rejection of material which happens to conflict with other data. It may be noticed as illustrating the independent standpoints of the Royal Annals that the Israelite account of conflicts with the Philistines ignores Judah (1 Kings xv. 27, xvi. 15; see XVIII, 542), and the Judæan account of Jehoram's troubles (2 Kings viii. 20 sqq.) makes no allusion to the bond that then united the two royal families.

<sup>3</sup> Consequently, David's alliance with a "real" king of the Aramaean Geshur instead of some South Palestinian locality becomes more improbable; see XVII, 790 sq.

<sup>4</sup> See *A. J. S. L.*, 148 sqq.; and Luther in Meyer, *op. cit.*, p. 194 sq.



revolt, the Israelites recall the debt they owed to David for the benefit which had been conferred upon them by his achievement (xix. 9).

These passages are extremely important, and on their natural interpretation must mean that David was supposed to have accomplished for Israel that which Saul had done in his day<sup>1</sup>. It cannot be said that this representation is historical, it ignores the situation in ii. 8 sq., and it is extremely significant that *Israel* only, and not Judah, is concerned. On the other hand, it is in entire agreement with the circumstance that when David became king over the north, Mephibosheth was not found in Israel (as might have been expected after ii. 8 sq.) but in the care of Machir of Lo-debar. Moreover, it now becomes significant that after the disaster at Gilboa the land was flooded with Philistines and Israel was forced to flee (i Sam. xxxi. 7). The situation is practically identical with that at the time of Saul's rise (cp. i Sam. xiii. 7). Accordingly, it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that the view prevailed that Israel owed its deliverance from the Philistines not to the first king of Israel, but to the first king of the united monarchy, and that although Saul was anointed to deliver Yahweh's people, his career was a failure, and the work of deliverance was accomplished by David. It is scarcely possible to misunderstand iii. 18, xix. 9, and all that they imply when viewed impartially, and one is thus in a position to recover a specific theory, which, although obviously of secondary origin, may have left its mark upon other narratives<sup>2</sup>.

But a state of oppression or even of vassalage ignores the fundamental difficulty that the Philistines appear to be indifferent whilst David was king of Hebron, and are not aroused until Judah and Israel were united. It is hardly conceivable that the relatively small Philistine *pentad* should have acted in this singular manner, and the problem is not simplified by the writer's former suggestion that Israel and Judah had been separately engaged in subduing the Philistines in the north and south respectively<sup>3</sup>. The surprising feature is the

<sup>1</sup> Cp. especially i Sam. ix. 16: "he shall save my people out of the hand of the Philistines."

<sup>2</sup> 2 Sam. xix. 9 occurs in a passage where Absalom's revolt (primarily a Judæan narrative) has been amplified by the inclusion of Israel (*A. J. S. L.*, 165). iii. 17 sq. has also some marks of a relatively late date, but there seems to be little in ii. 12-iii which is very old (*ibid.*, p. 149). Budde, on the other hand, argues that both passages belong essentially to the context. How a specific theory will influence earlier narratives is seen at its best in the later prominence of Sinai and the redaction that ensued in the account of the Exodus.

<sup>3</sup> *A. J. S. L.*, 150, 152, 154. Wellhausen, too, assumed that Ishbaal had established his dominion "of course in uninterrupted struggle with the Philistines" (*Ency. Brit.*, art. "Israel").

conquest of a *Jebusite* city and conflicts with the *Philistines*—the former belonging to the Canaanite, Amorite or non-Israelite inhabitants, the latter a perplexing race which, though vanquished by David, reappears some centuries later as an independent people<sup>1</sup>.

Our sources comprise the older portions of 2 Sam. v–viii, xxi–xxiv, a collection of miscellaneous extracts of the same general character, similar as regards style to the matter in 2 Sam. ii. 1–4 *a*, and to the Judæan annals in Kings. Chs. v–viii in their present form constitute a self-contained account of David's history at Jerusalem. In chap. v. 6 sqq. is related the capture of the Jebusite city and on the natural assumption the surrounding district was cleared. In a fight in the valley of Rephaim the "Philistines" were smitten from Gibeon (ver. 25, LXX and Chron.) to Gezer, and were one not influenced by the ethnic it could be inferred that the enemy were Canaanites, Jebusites, or the like. Now, among the stories in xxi, xxiii are the familiar engagements with the giants of Gath. These *יְלִי־יָהֳרָף*, by their very designation, associate themselves, as Budde has observed (*Sam.*, p. 310 sq.), with the *יְלִי־יָהֳרָף* whom Caleb overthrew at Hebron. There were traditions which knew of these ancient worthies elsewhere—at Gaza, Ashdod, and at Gath itself (Joshua xi. 21 sq.), and the traditions of Anakites are properly quite distinct from those which people the same district with the more tangible Philistines (*ibid.*, xiii. 3)<sup>2</sup>. It is highly probable, therefore, that in 2 Sam. v–viii, and in certain other cases, the "Philistines" have taken the place of another ethnic<sup>3</sup>. Had David been fighting the Philistines it would be difficult to account for the present dislocation, whereas those conflicts which, on geographical grounds, would have been expected in a context between Hebron and Jerusalem, would naturally clash with other traditions of David's progress<sup>4</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> They appear as a new enemy with whom both Saul and David have to reckon although the earlier history would have led us to expect some further account of that overthrow of the Canaanites which Solomon completed (see XVIII, 357 sq.). Should it be held that the two peoples were allied against Israel, this must also be borne in mind in those chapters in 1 Sam. where David of Bethlehem and Saul of Benjamin are concerned.

<sup>2</sup> The "valley of Rephaim" is also suggestive for primitive tradition; see Schwally, *Zeit. f. alttest. Wissensch.*, 1898, p. 130. On Joshua xi. 21 sq. and xiii. 3 (which are now Deut.), see Carpenter and Harford-Battersby, *Hex.*, ad loc.

<sup>3</sup> Cp. Joshua and Saul against Canaanites and Philistines respectively (XVIII, 123, 541); the relations of Danites to Amorites (Judges i. 34) and Philistines (*ibid.*, xiii. sqq.).

<sup>4</sup> vers. 17–21 may have been retained through a misunderstanding of "the hold," and it may have been thought that the defeat in vers. 22–25

The present distinctive narratives between ii. 11 and v deal with warfare before the capture of Jerusalem, but the traditions are of a more developed character, and even record a fight with Benjamites at Gibeon before the district around Jerusalem was taken! The compiler's general position is correct, but the details and character of the conflicts are untrustworthy. On the other hand, the primitive tradition suggests that David encountered the Anakites on his way to Jerusalem, and this is remarkably suggestive since the spies from Kadesh had seen the same mysterious folk, and Caleb had expelled the three "sons of Anak" from Hebron.

Thus we return again to S and the Kadesh traditions. Caleb and the Anakites find their parallel in the primitive tradition of David's men and the giants of Gath. Elsewhere David himself appears in the wilderness of Paran (Kadesh)<sup>1</sup>, at Ziklag and at Gath; he enters into relations with sheikhs south of Hebron, and his priest Abiathar bears with him the oracle. It is singular that it is precisely in 2 Sam. v-viii, xxi-xxiv that we have not only the traditions of David's conquests over the primitive populations, but also his dealings with Araunah (*sic*) the Jebusite and with the Gibeonites (with evidence for *another* aspect of his relations to Saul's family). It is here, too, that the ark is triumphantly installed in Jerusalem. To supplement what has already been said<sup>2</sup>, it now seems clear that S has a more definite value. The isolated details have a more real connexion, although it is still impossible to determine how much is history and how much later reflection. But it is evident that there is a lack of homogeneity. The ark appears in Num. x. 33 sqq. in a passage which may not be from the same source as vers. 29-32, where *Hobab* is mentioned. Abiathar's name suggests *Jethro*, and 1 Kings ii. 26 sq. (where he is said to have carried the ark before David) may be among the secondary portions of the chapter<sup>3</sup>. It is quite intelligible that one tradition associated the ark with the journey *from* Kadesh, another with David's progress *towards* Jerusalem. But these are quite distinct from the appearance of the ark with Joshua at Shiloh. Caleb the faithful spy and the Caleb of 1 Chron. ii belong to different strata. Caleb, who leaves Kadesh and smites Anakites at Hebron,

happened after the capture of Jerusalem; but in xxi and xxiii the scenes are Gath, Lehi, Adullam and Pas-dammim (cp. 1 Chron. xi. 13).

<sup>1</sup> See XVII, 789, n. 2.

<sup>2</sup> See above, pp. 365 sq. As for the traditions of connexions with E. Jordan we may notice the names in 2 Sam. xxiii. 34-39 (Zobah, Gad, &c.), and Mesha's remarkable notice of the capture of the ארזל דוד; הודד was apparently a local god.

<sup>3</sup> A. J. S. L., p. 175.

and David who fights the giants further north, belong to the same group of tradition, but no historical connexion can be traced between them. The conflicts with the men of Gath have all the air of primitive legend (cp. 2 Sam. xxiii. 9 sq., 18; 1 Chron. xi. 11, 20), but David's relations to Achish (1 Sam. xxvii, xxix) obviously stand upon another footing. The standpoint of S appears to indicate that a certain relationship was felt between the east of the Jordan and the south, although if this explains certain features in David's history it leaves his wars with Moab and Edom difficult. S points to a general movement northwards, whereas David's fight with Amalekites is a contrary tendency, and the hostility of the "enemies of Yahweh" does not belong to the older Kadesh stories. How varied the spirit which animates these diverse though not unconnected traditions needs no further illustration, and when we perceive how old traditions could be dismembered and supplanted, and when we recognize the scantiness of our material, it would be imprudent to attempt to recover all the half-obliterated steps.

It is clear that even the earlier traditions associated with David are not homogeneous, and this will probably be intelligible when we recollect that we have to deal not only with the individual traditions of the founder of a dynasty, but also with the growth of a tribe (Judah), and with the spread of a movement which ultimately (at all events) was associated with David's name. Some important conclusions can, however, be drawn. Judæan history starts with David, and there is little doubt that Saul's traditions continued to develop favourably before the rise of the tendency to belittle his character. The part played by Samuel in 1 Sam. ix does not appear to belong to the oldest account of Saul, and the figure of the seer in ch. xii, although considerably idealized, is not hostile to the king. Ch. xv, on the other hand, which has been used to describe his rejection, is a relatively late tradition: the idea of vengeance upon Amalek is secondary<sup>1</sup>. This chapter prepares the way for the introduction of David, which, in its turn, depends upon xiv. 52<sup>2</sup>. Thenceforth the

<sup>1</sup> That Samuel, perhaps originally of southern origin (XIX, 182), should be friendly to an Israelite king agrees with the interest which Saul takes in the Kenites, and finds a parallel in Jehu and the Rechabites (XVIII, 131). xiii. 7 b-15 describes the rejection of Saul immediately after his election; perhaps a writer who was familiar with the final review of the history of the northern kingdom (2 Kings xvii) is responsible for the insertion.

<sup>2</sup> "There was sore war against the Philistines all the days of Saul, and when Saul saw any mighty man or any valiant man he took him to him."

traditions represent incessant conflicts with Philistines, but only where the history of David is involved. It is probable that the defeat of Gilboa is no exception, since considerable difficulty is occasioned by the supposition that the *Philistines* marched northwards from their five cities and attacked Saul from Aphek. If the original tradition knew of some enemy whose home lay in the north the situation is inexplicable, and the motive which has influenced the redaction will be readily perceived when we recollect that the tradition of Saul's deliverance of Israel from the Philistine yoke was supplanted by that of David's achievement<sup>1</sup>.

Further, with this battle at Gilboa the present account of David's war with Amalek is involved, since his journey to Aphek with Achish of Gath allowed the Amalekites to take revenge for the raids from which they had suffered. The various difficulties in the narratives have already been noticed. David had taken refuge with Achish at Gath (1 Sam. xxvii. 1 sqq.), and accompanied the "Philistines" on the march (xxix, see XVIII, 132), but Ziklag was also his residence (xxvii. 6), and thither he returned to find it burned (xxx). The relation between the southern tribes is obscure, since David's customary expeditions were against Geshurites, Girzites (?), and Amalek<sup>2</sup>, but the specific occasion in xxvii. 10 is against the south of Judah, Jerahmeelites, and Kenites, and Achish's remark implies that this would concern Israel. The Amalekites actually retaliate upon Ziklag and the negeb of Cherethites and Caleb, although David

<sup>1</sup> On the general difficulties, see XVIII, 132. The use of the bow in 1 Sam. xxxi. 3 is more suggestive of 1 Kings xxiii. 34 than of 1 Sam. xvii. 5-7; the mention of Aphek (cp. iv. 1) is also interesting. The general situation, central Palestine (and no doubt a part of east of the Jordan) *versus* the north is reminiscent of Judges v. The lament from the Book of Jashar refers to the Philistines in 2 Sam. i. 20 (cp. Jer. xlvi. 14, Mic. i. 10), but this is scarcely decisive against the above view *unless* old poems were free from that revision which is constantly allowed in other writings. Klostermann's ingenious emendation in vv. 18 sq. brings in a reference to Judah, but the poem is written from the northern standpoint (cp. above, p. 372, n. 2). The Davidic authorship need scarcely be discussed. The one question is: *When* could David have uttered it? On the other hand, the poem proves how very little of the old traditions of Saul have been preserved. Its allusions to the personal characteristics of Saul and Jonathan, their mutual love, their bravery, the wealth which their conquests had brought to the people, are sufficient (for consistent criticism) to decide how far the Saul of old tradition has suffered from the later tendency to subordinate his figure to that of David.

<sup>2</sup> In xxvii. 8 the LXX suggests that the tenses should be frequentative as in ver. 9 (see Budde).

sends the recaptured spoil to clans (xxx. 26 sqq.), with whom, as king of Hebron, he became closely connected. It is freely recognized that 2 Sam. i. 6-10, 13 sqq., which contain a variant tradition of Saul's death, are later insertions—singularly enough the leading figure is an Amalekite. The opening details of the chapter are ambiguous, and appear to ignore 1 Sam. xxx, and the time occupied by David's pursuit of the raiders. Hence it is probable that the parenthetical "and David had returned from smiting Amalek<sup>1</sup>" is a gloss, and the account of the Amalekite war one of the latest insertions in the present traditions. It may well be based upon some conflict between Judah and the south—common enough in later times—and not improbably owes its insertion to the fact that Saul was credited with a defeat of the same people<sup>2</sup>.

It is probable that at some stage 1 Sam. xxiii. 1-14 was followed immediately by xxviii. 1 (see XVII, 788). Here we may perhaps recognize traces of a tradition that David advanced from Keilah to Gath. In their present form the narratives represent an attack upon the "Philistines" of Keilah, which scarcely agrees with his relations with Achish, and the latter, the king of Gath, can hardly have anything in common with the indigenous giants whom we meet in 2 Sam. xxi and xxiii. It is possible that the "Philistines" did not enter into the original traditions here, but it is obvious that at some period in the literary growth this ethnic could be historically correct. The evidence is much too scanty for the further discussion of the problem of the "Philistines" in these chapters, and if they are due in part to post-Deut. redaction, it is quite possible that dealings with the more tangible people of the eighth or seventh century B. C. have influenced the traditions<sup>3</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> וְיָשָׁב. Perfects with weak י are generally as suggestive as the unexpected introduction of frequentatives.

<sup>2</sup> Since it now appears that Davidic traditions are *inserted* at a period when those of Saul had been considerably developed, it is not unlikely that of the two parallels, 1 Sam. xiv. 47-51 and 2 Sam. viii, the former is the more original (see p. 347, above).

<sup>3</sup> The conjecture that one tradition traced David's steps through Keilah and Gath to Jerusalem recalls 2 Sam. xv. 18 sqq., where Ittai and his men are said to have come from Gath. The encounter with the "Philistines," in which David became known to Saul, may be based upon an old story of conflict with Anakites; Ephes-dammim (xvii. 1) is actually the scene in 1 Chron. xi. 13 (2 Sam. xxiii. 9), and it is noteworthy that the enemy are pursued northwards (ver. 52). It may be added that even in a chapter so relatively old as 1 Sam. xxv the essential purpose lies in the words of Abigail, where, as Reuss has observed :

The group of older Davidic traditions in 2 Sam. v-viii, xxi-xxiv, consists of fragments evidently from various sources now in a redacted form. They are distinctly reminiscent of the Judæan chronicles in Kings, and apparently it is to the same hand that we owe the similar miscellaneous notices of Solomon's life<sup>1</sup>. At all events, it is noteworthy that whilst 2 Sam. viii relates David's great conquests, 1 Kings v. 3, consistently enough, implies that his reign was one of incessant warfare. These annals of a great and glorious kingdom under the victorious David and the wise and bountiful Solomon are supplemented by more detailed narratives of a somewhat popular character (contrast 2 Sam. x, xii. 26 sqq.). The provoking allusions to significant events summarily mentioned in the chronicles of Judah and Israel are rarely elaborated, although popular tradition was surely able to supplement such scanty notices as 2 Kings viii. 20 sqq., xii. 20 sq., xiv. 19, xviii. 8, xxi. 23 sq., &c. But fortunately a number of traditions of David's life are preserved. The more primitive representation underlying 2 Sam. v-viii, xxi-xxiv shows that many of these cannot be accepted as trustworthy, they are of greater value for other topics than the history of the tenth cent. B. C. We have masterpieces of descriptive writing, but, as in the account of Absalom's revolt, the very conciseness points not to the contemporary, who is apt to lose himself in a maze of detail, but to a later age when tradition was crystallized. Considered as a literary or historical unit after or even in connexion with the above group, chs. ix-xx, present the gravest problems<sup>2</sup>. It is probably safer to regard them as an independent growth which had existed separately and were inserted in their present position with renewed revision and redaction. As they now stand, they imply that close relations had always subsisted between David and Saul (or Israel), and they give expression to the theory that David (the Judæan king) delivered Israel from the Philistines. Their true value lies in the fact that they enable us to understand the relations of Judah with its immediate neighbours, internal troubles among the Judæan clans, rivalry with Israel, and even intrigues with "nicht das Weib der Wüste, das von der Politik nichts weiss und von der Zukunft Davids nichts wissen kann, spricht hier, sondern der geschichtskundige Redaktor."

<sup>1</sup> e.g. 1 Kings ii. 10-12, iii. 3, iv sq., ix. For the literary criticism it is instructive to observe that iv, v, ix were originally contiguous (proved by the transposition of elements, and by comparison with the LXX), but have been *severed* by the account of the building of the temple, the insertion of which has been accompanied with appropriate revision. On the possibility that there was a history of the temple upon which compilers could draw see above, p. 349, n. 1.

<sup>2</sup> On their character see Luther in Meyer, *op. cit.*, 184 sq., 187, 195 sq.

Israelite military officials. But there is no continuity of history, and, although we can perceive the *intention* of the compilers, it is extremely difficult to trace the stages in the growth<sup>1</sup>.

This difficulty makes itself felt again when we leave the representation of Solomon, the great and powerful monarch, and turn to other traditions. The account of the troubles which threatened his kingdom (1 Kings xi. 14 sqq.) throws another light upon his reign, although it is obvious that it is the required introduction to the subsequent history. There are passages in 1 Kings i, ii which emphasize the important dissension in Judah before Solomon came to the throne. It would be difficult to imagine a more serious conflict of interests, its consequences were far-reaching; yet, when the compiler leaves this source and employs another, we are in another atmosphere. We gather from 1 Kings iv that the one district which

<sup>1</sup> The literary theory that ix-xx had been *omitted* by the Deut. redactor and subsequently restored in their present form is not proved by the repetition of the list of officers (L, viii. 15-18) at the close of xx (L<sup>1</sup>, vers. 23-26), as Budde and Kennedy argue. A compiler after inserting a passage will repeat a portion of the original either through error or in order to pick up the thread. But where is the thread continued, and why should L and L<sup>1</sup> be variant forms of the official list? L<sup>1</sup> perhaps presupposes some fuller record which has been ignored because it covered much the same ground as v-viii; we appear to meet with similar material in 1 Kings ii (p. 379, n. 1), and in this chapter the LXX has a list of Solomon's officials which differs from that in 1 Kings iv. In fact, the whole literary problem is extremely complex, since the allusions in 1 Kings ii. 5, 32 connect the murder of Abner and Amasa. This, by itself, suggests that both were in the same context. At present the former (ii. 12-iii) precedes L and the latter L<sup>1</sup>, and on historical grounds Absalom's revolt precedes David's great wars (in viii). Moreover, when the reconciliation is followed by the meeting with Judah and Israel at Gilgal (xix. 15, 40, the repetitions are significant), it is impossible to ignore the prominence of Gilgal in the traditions of Saul, and the extent to which those of David have been modelled upon them. Hence the conjecture that some "renewal of the kingdom" might have been expected in xix may not appear so incomprehensible as Budde declares (cp. 1 Sam. xi. 14 sq., and *A. J. S. L.*, 169). It is obvious that we have to deal with two or more stages of redaction, with extremely little material upon which to work. The attempt may be made (as in *A. J. S. L.* and Sect. I) to gain some consecutive history out of these intricate narratives, and if their complexity will be recognized the solution of the literary problems may be safely left to more competent hands than the present writer's. The general impression which is gained suggests that the key is to be found in a closer study of Kings and in the special investigation of the "chronicles of the kings of Judah."



had resisted his accession was exempt from the necessity of providing for his maintenance, and if Judaeen territory is included in ver. 9 sq., it is evident that the southern portion finds no place in the administration<sup>1</sup>.

Accordingly, when one proceeds to look beneath the surface of the early pre-monarchical period, and the remarkably abundant traditions of the remote age of Saul and David, it is impossible to ignore the intricacy of the problems. There is, indeed, a superficial unity in those narratives which have been invariably regarded as old, but the lack of homogeneity is patent. We are compelled to recognize that (*a*) there was one Saul, worthy of the panegyric in 2 Sam. i, the conqueror (1 Sam. xiv. 47-51), the authentic traditions of whose life are sadly few, and (*b*) there was the enemy of David, a petty and local character subordinated to the figure of the Judaeen, and constantly troubled by Philistine inroads. Again, there is (*c*) the David of Bethlehem who, from the first, was closely associated with Saul, Benjamin, and Israel, who delivered Israel from the Philistines, whose history is characterized by his chivalry and love towards Saul, Jonathan, and their descendants; and, there is (*d*) the David of Judaeen traditions, whose achievements are preserved in 2 Sam. v-viii, xxi-xxiv, and in old Judaeen narratives elsewhere, whose steps to the throne are through enterprise and war, a shadowy figure whose victories over prehistoric giants cleared the way for the foundation of the kingdom of Judah. It is evident that *b* and *c* are closely allied; they represent the prevailing view which the last compilers successfully imprinted upon their readers, but if it is recognized that *a* and *d* are earlier than *b* and *c*, these notes will have achieved their purpose.

But this is only the first stage in the criticism of this period. Although *a* and *d*, *b* and *c* appear to belong to distinct sources, it is evident that each has had a literary history, whether in its separate form or in the course of combination. The former contains undoubtedly late elements, the latter in its turn preserves some old traditions. It is obvious that *a* and, to a greater degree, *d* bring us into the midst of problems of the greatest significance. It had been noticed that *b* and *c* ignore the Jebusite or non-Israelite district, whereas it now appears from *d* that the earliest traditions

<sup>1</sup> The officials in iv. 9 sqq. are scarcely Judaeen. They may be foreigners (Gray, *Heb. Proper Names*, pp. 73 sq.), but this is singular in view of other traditions of the king. The possible connexion between Ben-deker (ver. 9) and Bidkar (the officer of Ahab and Jehu) is interesting, because the list really appears to represent a division of the kingdom from the standpoint of the north.

ascribed to David the conquest of an alien area of much greater extent. This is intelligible when we perceive that the older traditions of Joshua, from their standpoint, recognize as hostile not merely Gibeon, but a *pentad* of cities, comprising Jerusalem, Jarmuth, Lachish, Eglon, and even Hebron (Joshua x). It is manifest that the study of the early period not only reveals the interest taken in the foundation of the monarchy by late writers, but throws another light upon the Israelites and their tribal divisions.

## IX. CONCLUSION.

THE clue to the study of the traditions of David and to the criticism of the period lies in the figure of Saul, the older accounts of whose work are to be found in 1 Sam. xiv. 47-51, and underlie those narratives which agree with the situation embodied in the redactor's notices (see above). Saul met his end in a defeat from the north, and whatever success Ishbaal achieved was doubtless through the help of Abner, the captain of his army (2 Sam. ii. 8-10a). Here, unfortunately, the independent annals are broken off<sup>1</sup>. We expect some prelude to the statement that Saul took "the kingdom over Israel" (1 Sam. xiv. 47), and, on literary grounds, one is induced to associate with the annals: vii. 13-17 (the close of Samuel's career) and the foundation of the monarchy. The latter is a composite narrative, and this, with the complicated character of the present introduction to the oppression of the Philistines and Ammonites (Judges x. 6 sqq.), serves to illustrate the fact that literary intricacy and repeated development of tradition go hand in hand. Indeed, the literary features are so complex that one hesitates to attempt to trace the growth of the traditions. At all events, Judges x appears to have been connected originally with Saul's overthrow of the Philistines; next, Samuel the seer plays a part in the rise of Saul; and, finally, the achievement is ascribed to Samuel himself. We may assume that the hand responsible for chap. vii associated Saul's rise with the Ammonite oppression<sup>2</sup>. The real difficulty, however, lies in the criticism of the Deuteronomic redaction, which is known to have been a continued process, and not a single example of literary activity. Already, it is freely recognized that Judges xvii-xxi are due to post-Deut. insertion, but the close connexion as regards subject-matter between this Appendix and 1 Sam. i sqq. cannot be set aside. It is probable that the abruptly introduced

<sup>1</sup> Their general resemblance to the Israelite chronicles in Kings has already been noticed. These scarcely began with Jeroboam, since David and Solomon would naturally be regarded as kings of Israel, and ought to have found a place in them. With Ishbaal's short reign we may compare Nadab, Elah, and Ahaziah, all weak successors of powerful monarchs, and with the prominence of his captain Abner it is interesting to observe the successful intrigues of other military officials. A famous example is Omri, but still more famous is the case of the commander Jehu, who, if properly a son of the *Judaean* Jehoshaphat (2 Kings ix. 2, 14), was a kinsman of Jehoram.

<sup>2</sup> One or two features suggest that even at this later stage the Introduction was followed by 1 Sam. vii. See XVIII, 127.

story of Eli at Shiloh, with the account of Samuel's youth, is intended to form an introduction to the seer's prominence in chap. vii sqq., in particular to the great victory with which he was credited. The insertion of explanatory or introductory material is always intelligible, and with the traditions encircling Shiloh we must associate the subsequent appearance of the priests at Nob. The fall of the sanctuary leads to the settlement near the capital. Here, at all events, it is clear that the presence of Israelite priests a few miles north of Jerusalem, the Jebusite city, the ferocity of Saul (now a mere local king at Gibeah, xxii. 6), and his attitude towards both David and Jonathan are sufficient to indicate the relative lateness of xxi. 1-9, xxii. 6-23, and of the series to which these passages belong. Incidentally, the fact that the priests are slain by an *Edomite*, in a narrative which is late in its present form, is extremely suggestive<sup>1</sup>.

It is very embarrassing to find that the tendency to subordinate the older written traditions of Saul to those of David is late—apparently post-Deuteronomic—since it is evident that the former, with all their scantiness, must represent the fruit of centuries. Saul's defeat of the Philistines is not only overshadowed by Samuel's victory (which is unhistorical and clearly late), but the fragmentary remains of his achievement now give the greater prominence to Jonathan, whose romantic attachment to David stands in marked contrast to the father's hatred (see XVIII, 124). Consequently, it is not easy to perceive the relation between 1 Sam. vii, which removes all fear of the Philistines, and the view in 2 Sam. iii. 18, xix. 9, that it was David who freed Israel from the oppression, unless we assume that this view, together with the redaction which accompanies it, is secondary<sup>2</sup>. There are difficulties of a more serious character. The account of Saul's deliverance of Jabesh-Gilead looks like one of the stories of the "judges," as though the last judge became the first king. It suggests that in early tradition Saul's centre of influence was to be found beyond

<sup>1</sup> Whilst Judges xvii sq. contain traditions closely allied to those of Eli and the ark (see XIX, 181 sq.), xix-xxi (which are inimical to Saul's traditional tribe) are probably intended to pave the way for the new prominence of Benjamin (see XVIII, 536 sq.). The present stories in iv sq. may be based upon good traditions of Shiloh (note that the "Philistines" encamp in Aphék), but must be viewed from a much later standpoint. The account of the installation of the ark in 2 Sam. vi is now connected with 1 Sam. vii. 1, but this is obviously contradicted by 1 Kings ii. 26; in the tradition which underlies 2 Sam. vi it is of course possible that Obed-edom the Gittite was not a Philistine but one of David's men who came from Gath (cp. p. 378, n. 3).

<sup>2</sup> See above, pp. 376 sqq., on 1 Sam. xiv. 52, xxxi, &c.

the Jordan<sup>1</sup>—at all events, it is clear that it was not originally in Benjamin. Now, the writer in vii. 14, after describing the defeat of the *Philistines* in the south, states that there was peace between Israel and the *Amorites*! The change is suggestive in view of analogous fluctuation elsewhere, and one can scarcely determine *what* tradition and *whose* tradition has been used to enhance the greatness of Samuel. It is also noteworthy that of the two narratives which narrate Saul's prowess in Palestine—and both have been used to describe his sin—that in xiv finds a parallel in the account of Joshua's overthrow of the southern Canaanites. The various points of contact between Saul and Joshua are perplexing<sup>2</sup>, and it is difficult to understand them unless there was a tendency to ascribe to Saul wars against a people of the south who were *not* Philistines. A transference of tradition (e.g. from Joshua to Saul) is intelligible, but it is also possible that the features are not due to intentional introduction, but are a survival. Moreover, it is not easy to understand why a writer should have introduced the "Amorites" into vii. 14, whereas a tradition of conflicts between them and Israel could well have been redacted in order to introduce the "Philistines".

Now, if we look back to the traditions relegated to the earliest periods, we meet with a twofold representation of the origin of Israel: the entrance of the ancestors from the north; the invasion of the Israelites themselves from the south. The general trend of the former is to suggest that a footing was gained in Palestine<sup>3</sup>, whereas in the Exodus we have the story of a land to be conquered in its entirety, previous intercourse between the ancestors and the inhabitants being ignored. Both Abraham and Jacob enter the land (the latter from Gilead), pass to Shechem, and thence proceed south to Bethel. Jacob himself takes Shechem with his sword and bow—central Palestine, it was perhaps thought, was the first to be taken. At a point between Ai<sup>5</sup> and Bethel Lot separates from Abram; and below Bethel, Rachel (a tribe-name?) dies, Benjamin is born, and the compiler (who replaces the older source by P) narrates the sons of Jacob, and preserves among Edomite lists a brief statement of the separation of Jacob and Esau (Gen. xxxvi. 6–8, cp. xiii. 6).

<sup>1</sup> See XVIII, 541.

<sup>2</sup> See XVIII, 123, and n. 5, 130 sq., 537, 538, n. 1.

<sup>3</sup> It is hardly necessary to notice that not only are iv sq. and vii derived from different documents, but the geographical situation is different.

<sup>4</sup> Cp. Meyer, *op. cit.*, pp. 228, 433; Luther, pp. 108 sq. A reference to the Exodus in the patriarchal stories is exceptional (Gen. xv. 12–16).

<sup>5</sup> On Ai see XVIII, pp. 538 sq., and for traditions of fights in its neighbourhood, cp. Judges xx.

Joshua from Gilgal overcomes Canaanite cities in a fight in which the same spot between Ai and Bethel is conspicuous, and his attack upon the southern Canaanites and his dealings with Gibeon find their echo in the achievements of Saul. But whilst Saul, like Joshua, proceeds from Gilgal, there is the possibility that both were more closely associated with central Palestine. However, the general movement is (certainly in the case of Abraham and Jacob) from the north and east towards the south, with traditions of conflict and of new tribal relations in districts which are connected with Benjamin and Judah<sup>1</sup>.

On the other hand, in the story of Isaac we are in the south; the patriarch enters into a covenant relation with Abimelech and the Philistines<sup>2</sup>. Jacob separates from Esau-Edom and departs for the land east of the Jordan, even as "Hezron," the father of Caleb and Jerahmeel, goes to Gilead<sup>3</sup>. The general tendency is that of S. But, in addition to this, the theory underlying S appears to have influenced the story of Abraham, since the *insertion* of Gen. xii. 10-xiii. 1 places the separation of Lot and Abram *after* the ascent from Egypt<sup>4</sup>. The complete fusion of S and C appears in the twofold move of Jacob (i. e. Israel)<sup>5</sup>, and the story of Joseph succeeds in linking together successfully the entrance of the ancestors and the subsequent invasion of the Israelites. The story of Joseph, however, has very distinctive features of its own, and appears to be an independent cycle which has been used to form a connecting link<sup>6</sup>. Similarly, the invasion in the book of Joshua has no original connexion with the Kadesh cycle, and Saul and David, the two prominent heroes of C and S, are not brought together until the independent traditions of Saul have undergone considerable growth.

<sup>1</sup> See further, XVIII, 536 sqq.

<sup>2</sup> One is reminded of David and Achish, and the latter is actually called Abimelech in Ps. xxxiv, title. The name Achish (LXX *αρχους*, i. e. *ארכוש*) has been identified with that of Ikauus king of Ekron (seventh century).

<sup>3</sup> 1 Chron. ii. 21 sq.; according to the northern standpoint Machir is half-Aramaean (vii. 14). In Num. xxxii. 40 sq. (where Machir is the son of Manasseh) fusion has already taken place.

<sup>4</sup> If (as seems probable) this is due to method one may perhaps notice the expulsion of Hagar and Ishmael followed by the journey of Eliezer to Nahor's city. Even Jacob's bones are removed in peace to Abel-Mizraim beyond the Jordan (Gen. l. 11), but for obvious reasons his sons return again to Egypt.

<sup>5</sup> Hence the separation from Esau and the visit to Bethel are each mentioned twice.

<sup>6</sup> See Luther in Meyer, *op. cit.*, pp. 142 sqq.

Accordingly, we are led to conclude that C has preserved the recollection of an entrance from the north which has been fused with that of an invasion from the south. The former is the kind of tradition which could have been retained orally for centuries. The old stories of Britain tell of the entrance of a hero (Brutus) who filled the land with his descendants. C, in turn, has heroic figures who, however, seem to have been of local origin—it is intelligible that an immigration would be associated with different names in different districts. Jacob is primarily the conqueror of Shechem<sup>1</sup>; Joshua belongs rather to the south of Ephraim; Saul's origin is conjectural. No historical connexion can be traced between the three: Saul, Joshua, and Jacob; each takes his place in biblical history; each becomes ever less tangible; the development is greater, and the fusion with S more pronounced. So, also, there is no historical bond between Caleb and David; Judaeon history commences with David, and his traditions make him contemporary with the first king of Israel. The first king entered Judah by conquest, and his traditions are partly individual or personal, and partly tribal or national. The same appears to be true also of Saul. Although the latter appears before us as a tangible figure, his traditions are replete with grave problems, and one cannot ignore the possibility that there may have been a tendency (as in other fields) to historicize heroic legends. It is conceivable that the written history of Palestine once began with Saul, who afterwards became the first king.

The traditions of a Caleb or of a David with movements against an alien people are scarcely those of historical figures. It is no mere belt of cities between Judah and Ephraim which is recognized, but an entire hostile district (p. 382). There is no evidence for the assumption that Joshua's defeat of the southern Canaanites was followed by a loss of territory, or that David encountered Israelites at Adullam, Timnah, or Chezib (Gen. xxxviii). On the other hand, it is clear from the literary analysis that the oldest portions of Joshua x recognize as hostile Jerusalem, Hebron, Jarmuth, Lachish, and Eglon<sup>2</sup>, whereas it is ix. 17, a *post-exilic* source, which supports the theory of a thin strip of non-Israelite territory. The latter

<sup>1</sup> There was doubtless some reason for the account of the Canaanite war ascribed to him in Jubilees xxxiv. (It is very instructive to observe the growth between JE, P, and Jubilees—still more suggestive is the chronological relation between the three.)

<sup>2</sup> This pentad possibly accounts for the tradition of the five Philistine cities. C's standpoint in Joshua ix sq. seems to reappear in 1 Chron. vii. 21 where there are feuds between Ephraim and the men of Gath "born in the land."

recurs in passages embedded in P (Joshua xv. 63, cp. xvi. 10), is illustrated by Judges xix. 10, 12, and finds support in Judges i. Now, it has been seen that C and S bring us into the midst of Palestinian history without throwing any light upon the tribes of Israel; they give us the invasion of Palestine and the movement from the south, but do not solve the problem of the *Israelite* invasion. On the one hand, it is held that Joshua gives an exaggerated account of the settlement to which the details in Judges i are to be preferred. It is agreed, also, that not all the tribes took part in the invasion under Joshua, and various reconstructions have been proposed, with the help of Judges i and the tribal details elsewhere. But to maintain Judges i it is usual to reject even the oldest traditions of Joshua, and to present a reconstruction it is necessary to go behind Judges i<sup>1</sup>. On the other hand, the stories of Joshua appear to be those of conquest and extension from the standpoint of C<sup>2</sup>, whereas Judges i gives a representation subsequent to the fusion of S and C. It is really questionable whether the two ought to be compared. In fact, the treatment of Judah, Simeon, and Caleb will scarcely inspire confidence, and since the fusion of S and C is relatively late, it becomes somewhat remarkable that the theory of the belt of cities is found in P itself, embedded in P, or in passages (viz. Judges i, xix) which owe their presence to post-Deuteronomic redaction<sup>3</sup>.

The fusion of the two movements in C and S is found to underlie the patriarchal narratives in their present form. These, as also the tribal schemes, can scarcely claim the antiquity invariably ascribed to them. It is customary to assume that the recollection of details of invasion and settlement, and of early tribal history was faithfully preserved for some centuries in oral tradition. The experience of history is against such an assumption. Tribal relations and the like are apt to vary, and although a complete tribal scheme is conceivable for the years when Judah and Israel were united under David and Solomon, the administration of the latter in 1 Kings iv is not on

<sup>1</sup> Judges i. 4, 8-10, 18 are recognized as additions; on vers. 5-7 see Meyer, pp. 438 sq.

<sup>2</sup> It is now improbable that Joshua's victories are based upon those of Saul and David (so XVIII, 133, 355); Joshua and Saul are independent figures, and the former belongs to a body of tradition quite distinct from David.

<sup>3</sup> It is difficult to explain the origin of the non-Israelite belts of cities in the south and north. Since Shechem itself is not mentioned, they may possibly represent the view in Ephraim and Manasseh after the entrance from the east, and before the fusion with tribes in the south and north (cp. XIX, 180).



the lines of the tribal divisions, and excludes the south of Palestine. Moreover, on ordinary grounds, it is hardly probable that early divisions were maintained throughout the monarchy, when it is only in the latest literature that the schemes are made to work. The few historical allusions in the patriarchal narratives are inconclusive, and this is not unnatural, since popular tradition will often ignore the events which interest historical research<sup>1</sup>. Although many of the internal data (e.g. life, language) are not decisive, the highly developed form and lofty tone of the traditions are very significant. Those who maintain the older view, that J, E, and P in the Pentateuch cannot extend over a great number of centuries, are justified by the close connexion which subsists between the sources. It is well known that in an early stage of literary criticism, P was rent in two: the legal elements were recognized to be post-exilic, but the narrative portions were retained at the beginning together with J and E. But the anomaly of "separating its members by an interval of half a millenium" was intolerable, and the present Graf-Wellhausen hypothesis, which makes both post-exilic, has gained yearly in force. Whilst literary criticism has rejected the older assumption of the passive existence of laws for ages before they had practical influence, historical criticism, in its turn, perhaps will not be prepared to admit the passive existence of historical conditions and situations when JE and P are severed, as at present, by a considerable chronological gap. P has undoubtedly much that is artificial, and his conception of the past is in many respects untrustworthy, but there is something incredible in the prevailing assumption that the historical foundation for his ideas is removed from his own age by centuries of warfare, revolt, immigration, and a multitude of disturbing elements<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> Cp. Langlois and Seignobos, *Introd. to Study of History*, p. 181, note.

<sup>2</sup> Whatever be the accepted date of Gen. xxxviii, is it plausible to suppose that it preserves Judæan tribal-history of pre-Davidic ages when David himself has conflicts with the "giants" in the same district? Its point lies in the strengthening of Judah by the clans Perez and Zerah — which are exilic. The story is of purely local interest, and although there are no primitive traits of chronological value, the penalty of burning is unusual (Lev. xx. 14, xxi. 9), and associates itself with Jubilees xx. 4 rather than with assumed earlier usage. The *Kedeshôth*, too, do not become disreputable until later times, Moreover, whatever be the date of Gen. xxxiv, has this, also, preserved the history of the earliest period? It is strange that P should be content to resurrect so antiquated a fragment unless the tradition were a living one, and if it were still fresh, the intricate racial history of Central Palestine must be taken into consideration (see p. 361).

Since one theory cannot be refuted by another, it is unnecessary to consider those reconstructions of the earlier history of Israel which admittedly rest upon tribal and genealogical data (cp. p. 343). The entire question is one of perspective. By approaching the evidence from another standpoint, we have come upon two great bodies of tradition neither of which is "Israelite" in the accepted sense of the term. It has been found that the distinctive feature of S is the movement from the south into Palestine. The account of the journey from Kadesh has been drastically treated in order to adapt it to the traditions of an invasion from the east (ultimately from the north). This suggests the preponderating influence of central Palestine. The same is apparent when all the tribes enter from across the Jordan; when all are grouped together as "sons" of Aramean wives, and when Jacob brings his family from an Aramean locality. So far from Judah and Israel being the parallel but rival names of the monarchy, Jacob becomes the father of Judaeans and Israelites, of Levites and laymen alike. If confidence is to be placed in the tribal schemes, one might be tempted to suppose that Joseph tribes entered and spread themselves over the Leah tribes<sup>1</sup>, and that the invasion of C was superimposed upon that of S. But, when the entire evidence is viewed more comprehensively, it is evident that such an explanation is insufficient. The literary evidence and the arrangement of the material suggest that the traditions of Central Palestine go back further; its history is the older. The traditions of its first king have been considerably developed before the history of Judah begins, and whatever the independent traditions of Judah may have been, some time has elapsed before the figure of David gains ascendancy. It appears that there was a specific redaction of narratives of Judaeans origin for the purpose of introducing the north (Israel). At the same time, a number of traditions cluster around Benjamin and North Judah; and it is fairly obvious that they are of local origin. Although local traditions are naturally found everywhere, it is not mere chance alone which has preserved them in the O. T. The northern tribes would have their own cycles; but, lying outside the interest of compilers, they were ignored. It is intelligible that David's renown would explain the presence of our stories, but great figures are ubiquitous in legend, and their traditions appear in many places and in many shapes. Thus, we require some explanation of the insertion of traditions which represent a late tendency, appear to be due to post-Deuteronomic redaction, and have the effect of making David's figure finally supreme over Judah and Israel.

<sup>1</sup> So XIX, 179 sq.

With S we may associate the Levites. They appear to have regarded themselves of southern origin, a tradition which could be shared by all members of the caste whether actually correct or not. We have to picture them scattered throughout Palestine and east of the Jordan, retaining some recollection of the nomadic district whence they had come, absorbing the thought and traditions of those in whose midst they settled. Thus, as Levites, they are traced back to Levi a son of Jacob, and appear *in pari passu* with Judah, Simeon, Dan, and the rest. Ultimately, they are congregated around Jerusalem, and David the first king of Judah is looked upon as the organizer of their divisions. In Judah and the Levites it is not impossible that an explanation may be found which will account for the standpoint of S, and for some of its literary features. It is evident that whatever literature existed in ancient Israel, biblical criticism must start with the material which has been handed down, and the form in which it finally appeared. Everything points to continued redaction and to an abundance of literary material in earlier times. It is not inconceivable that the Levites had a hand in shaping old traditions<sup>1</sup>, and we cannot forget that it is in the district around Jerusalem that we are to look for the families of the scribes who are associated partly with Kenites and partly with other clans whose traditions were essentially those of S. The final supremacy of Judah and the prominence of Jerusalem as the religious centre of Judaism are historical facts, and one is tempted to connect with them the final supremacy of Judaeon traditions over those of non-Judaeon origin. Also, the ultimate appearance of Levites around Jerusalem may possibly explain the late introduction of local stories<sup>2</sup>.

But it is not proposed to lay any weight upon such conjectures, since the literary and historical problems take us into post-Davidic periods during and after the monarchy. Where the O. T. is concerned criticism cannot confine itself either to any one specified period or to any series of contiguous narratives which prove to have originated at different periods. On the other hand, bodies of documents may be handled independently and analogous conclusions may result; and when the investigation is distributed over a fairly large field, results which are concurrent gain in force. In biblical study the "indestructibility of matter" is a truism. Criticism does not destroy material; it changes the prospect and view-point. That which is

<sup>1</sup> See Meyer, *op. cit.*, pp. 83 sqq.

<sup>2</sup> Another interesting literary feature is the final separation of the book of Joshua (the *one* book which fuses the invasions of S and C) from the books which precede.

rejected as genuine history may reappear with truer value as a human document, and when a narrative which is unhistorical in one context is found to illuminate or illustrate a later period its value becomes immensely enhanced. Now, not a few indications have been observed which take one far away from the remote age to which the narratives are relegated to periods where the history becomes more real, and where it would be a distinct gain to be able to supplement the relatively scanty records by some insight into contemporary life<sup>1</sup>. However, it would have been premature to attempt definite reconstructions before the entire trend of biblical history had been passed under review or to frame hypotheses of S before the fortunes of Judah had been handled. It is obvious that the criticism of the old traditions of Saul and David will ultimately determine the subsequent vicissitudes of Israel and Judah, and the questions which have been raised are of fundamental importance for the written records of Palestine in the earlier periods. Palestine itself is naturally a unit and, from the independent standpoint of C, Judah and Jerusalem essentially formed part of the whole<sup>2</sup>. The separation of Central Palestine from the south (and *not* the reverse) is a problem in itself. The severance is not a natural one, the line of demarcation more artificial than real. Additional obscurity is caused by the political position of Benjamin, a tribe whose origin is apparently not pre-Davidic. With it is involved the question of Jerusalem; would not the possession of it be the aim of the north? And if S has the traditions of an historical invasion, would the movement stop with the capture of Jerusalem and the district? It is quite intelligible that Rehoboam should have gone to Shechem to be crowned, but why should David be content to make Jerusalem his capital? On the other hand, if (as in Pentateuchal criticism) we look back upon the past, and view the career of Judah as a separate kingdom, with Jerusalem as the great religious centre, how much of the records may not be due to reflection? It is precisely in the history of Benjamin and Judah

<sup>1</sup> The richness of the material which has been relegated to the earlier periods stands in such vivid contrast to the scanty records of the divided monarchy that one is apt to gain a false idea of the true proportion of things. Further, one is apt to take for granted the many vital events in later history without reflecting sufficiently upon their significance. It is quite legitimate, at all events, to attempt to picture such brief notices with the help of the more detailed description of analogous incidents elsewhere.

<sup>2</sup> C's traditions point to conquest in the south (e.g. Joshua), and the annals of Saul, with conquests over Edom, Moab, and Amalek, imply that Judah must have been reckoned to Israel.

(where "half a millennium" constantly intervenes between the stages)<sup>1</sup> that one must seek for the key to S, and until the required backgrounds have been recovered it would be undesirable to pursue the investigation further<sup>2</sup>. Central Palestine (Israel proper) was naturally

<sup>1</sup> Cp. e. g. XIX, 184, n. 1.

<sup>2</sup> The relative abundance of material and the possession of external evidence (from Assyrian sources) make the period from Ahab to Jehu the natural starting-point for another independent examination of the traditions. A few points of contact between the traditions of Samuel and Saul and those of Elijah and Elisha have been mentioned (see XVIII, 131, 349, 531), and a few historical parallels have been incidentally hinted at. Now, in 1 Kings xix Elijah flees to Beersheba and Horeb, where he witnesses the theophany in a cave. His zeal for Yahweh and his complaint are rewarded by the promise of a faithful remnant, and his despair at the prevailing Baal-worship is removed by the tidings that another would complete his work. One is reminded of Moses on the mount (cp. Burney, *Kings*, p. 230), where, too, reluctance and complaint, promise and selection are leading motives. Subsequent narratives relate the overthrow of the Tyrian Baal-worship and the fall of Omri's house; the leading spirit in the reform is Jehonadab ben Rechab. The Rechabites were obviously opposed to all luxury, and in favour of a simpler worship of Yahweh, and the association of Rechabites with Kenites, &c.—suggestive enough—is enhanced by the fact that the old laws in Exod. xxxiv are thoroughly imbued with this spirit of simplicity. On the one hand, it is perfectly certain that there must have been an amount of tradition concerning the great events upon which our narratives are comparatively brief; this prominence of the south at Jehu's rise provokes deeper study (see Meyer, pp. 83 sqq.; Luther, *ib.*, pp. 137 sqq.). On the other hand, in S we have found the selection of the worshippers of Yahweh and the journey of Kenites and allied clans into Palestine—originally from Kadesh, but now in a context which points to Sinai or Horeb. It is possible that a real connexion could be found between these details. But the historical criticism of the period from Ahab to Jehu is extremely intricate. The traditions imply extremely close relations between Judah and Israel under Omri's dynasty (note the kings Ahaziah and Jehoram), and although *both* reigning families were exterminated Jehu became king only of the north. About half a century later we find that Jerusalem suffered a loss which it is impossible to treat merely as the outcome of a quarrel (2 Kings xiv. 13 sq.). Why the partial destruction of its walls, the removal of hostages, the looting of temple and palace treasure? Why, too, are there contradictory chronological notices after this disaster? Revenge was taken upon Judah, and when one turns to its history for this vital period we no longer meet with the popular sources, but with a new one introduced with marked abruptness, with priests instead of prophets, with a six

associated with the north, whilst the kingdom of Judah was nothing without the tribes and clans which lay to its south, and with this it agrees that Judah and Benjamin as a unit seem to presuppose the movement in S (XVIII, 540).

The aim in these notes has been to collect the evidence, to interpret it naturally, and to follow out the indications which were afforded. It is obvious that the risk of error increases at each step. It cannot be ignored, therefore, that other interpretations might be found, and more satisfactory explanations might be forthcoming. Nevertheless, consistency demands the application of those principles which are employed in the criticism of the Hexateuch, and to reconcile differences or to obscure difficulties which should prove to be genuine, would be no other than the method of the opponents of biblical criticism themselves. It is manifest that the problems turn, in the first instance, upon our conception of what is meant by the term Israel (cp. pp. 344 sq.). The traditions of the entrance from the east and of a northern home may very well have been the heritage of the national Israel, the northern kingdom, which in its palmy days overshadowed its southern rival if it did not include it. The traditions of Judah were doubtless to a large extent similar to those of Ephraim, but persistent evidence points to the existence of a distinct group of tradition. This may well have been disseminated and developed through that caste who are subsequently known as Levites, and when Judah became the new Israel in a religious sense, traditions of specifically Judæan origin may have been incorporated. At all events, the entrance of the ancestors and the invasion of the Israelites themselves are two distinct factors, and it is now plain perhaps that each must be taken along with other allied traditions, and that they must be consistently criticized throughout. But no finality can be

years' interval before the daughter of Jezebel is slain, and with noteworthy supplementary details in 2 Chron. It would seem that the events between the time when Judah and Israel were closely united and when Amaziah suffered an overwhelming defeat have been obscured. Did Judah break away from Israel some time after Jehu's accession? Finally, it is at this period that the significant features of Yahwism become prominent in the work of Elijah. Consequently, for literary and historical criticism, and for the development of specifically Israelite ideas, the history from Ahab to Jehu is of the first importance, and it is obvious that, although for our early periods with their two distinct standpoints the bulk of narratives in 1 Kings xvii—2 Kings x must be taken into consideration, these must be subjected in their turn to thorough criticism. See, on points of detail, pp. 349, n. 1, 353, n. 5, 355, n. 2, 359, n. 1, 372, n. 2, 379, n. 1.

attained so long as those periods, where we are to look for historical light upon the internal conditions, continue to be shrouded in obscurity. Where so much of the evidence is still uncertain, it would be unwise, however, to neglect the more general considerations which bear upon the subject<sup>1</sup>. Consequently, one cannot adopt implicitly the standpoint of those writers who looked back upon the past as the result of a magnificent invasion, as though the history were that of a single stock uninfluenced by its surroundings. One cannot ignore the earlier situations or the trend of internal and external conditions in post-biblical times; these, with the help of recent archaeological research, combine to set the history of Israel in a truer perspective. Palestine was the scene of momentous events long before our historical records, and these pass over much that was of historical importance and fell strictly within their limits. The antiquity of history does not necessarily involve the antiquity of the surviving sources; there were no doubt old traditions to which the writers had access (cp. p. 350), but criticism is confined naturally to those which actually survive.

At successive periods the history of the past was variously apprehended and shaped, and whilst the scientific examination of the "historical kernel" is a pursuit of absorbing interest for students of history, the religious spirit which influences each successive development remains untouched. Historical criticism applies itself to the traditions, the great truths of which they have become the vehicle are in no wise affected when authorship is denied, dates altered, or when more drastic changes result. The truths owe their value to their inherent qualities, and are irrespective of technical questions of authorship, contemporaneity or credibility. The lasting value of the Old Testament is entirely independent of its dress. It is true that ancient writers, in accordance with custom, supported their teaching by appeal to authority (pp. 352 sq.), but we of the present day must distinguish between the spirit and the letter, between the motives by which they were actuated and the means they took to make their lesson effective. It is impossible to overlook the freedom with which these writers handled their material, and their methods demand comprehensive and unbiassed investigation, but their aims and the spirit which breathes throughout will always evoke appreciation and sympathy, which will be enhanced as the work of criticism advances, and the more one succeeds in throwing oneself back into the past, the conceptions of the ancient writers of Israel gain increasingly in grandeur and reality.

STANLEY A. COOK.

<sup>1</sup> See above, pp. 343 sqq.